

THE PROFFERED PEN: SAINT-SIMONIANISM AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE  
IN 19TH CENTURY FRANCE

by

MICHAEL BRICK

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of History  
and the Graduate School at the University of Oregon  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Arts

March 2011

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Michael Brick

Title: The Proffered Pen: Saint-Simonianism and the Public Sphere in 19th Century France

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Department of History by:

Dr. George Sheridan	Chair
Dr. David Luebke	Member
Dr. Daniel Pope	Member

and

Richard Linton	Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School
----------------	--

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School

Degree awarded March 2011

© 2011 Michael Brick

## THESIS ABSTRACT

Michael Brick

Master of Arts

Department of History

March 2011

Title: The Proffered Pen: Saint-Simonianism and the Public Sphere in 19th Century France

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. David Luebke

The French “utopian socialist” movement known as Saint-Simonianism has long been recognized for its influence among 19th century engineers. An examination of the early Saint-Simonian journal, *Le Producteur*, however, reveals the articulation of an appeal to contemporary men of letters. A survey of the life and career of Hippolyte Carnot, a prominent Saint-Simonian man of letters, confirms and illustrates the nature of this appeal as it developed alongside Saint-Simonian ideology. Central to this appeal was the Saint-Simonians’ attributing to the “artist” the role of moral educator. In their conceptualization of this function, the Saint-Simonians essentially presented a model of what Jürgen Habermas has termed the “public sphere” in strong contrast to that of classical liberalism. In the final analysis, however, the Saint-Simonians can be read as arguing not for the totalitarian domination of public life (as some have suggested) but rather the necessity of what Antonio Gramsci described as “hegemony.”

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Michael Brick

### GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene  
Columbia University, New York

### DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, History, 2011, University of Oregon  
Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy and History, 2007, Columbia University

### AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

19th Century European Intellectual History  
The Emergence of the “Public Sphere”  
The Political and Economic Context of the Glorious Revolution  
The Emergence of Early Modern French Absolutism

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

English language assistant, Académie de Clermont-Ferrand, France,  
2010 to present

Teaching assistant, Department of History, University of Oregon, Eugene,  
2008-2010

### GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, History, 2008-2010

Geddes Graduate Scholarship, 2008

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe considerable thanks Professors Luebke, Pope and especially Sheridan for their patience and flexibility. I must also thank Professor Luebke for introducing me to the history of the public sphere, Professor Sheridan for directing me to the Saint-Simonians and also Professor Ludovic Frobert for discussing my project with me in its earliest stages. Finally, I should thank my colleague Jon Holtgreffe and Kim Wolltree at the University of Oregon Graduate School, who have both been of exceptional assistance over the past month in facilitating the final steps of this process.

To my parents, teachers, and friends, for their inspiration, confidence and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Saint-Simonianism as a Movement .....	1
Saint-Simonianism as an Ideology .....	4
The Question of Totalitarianism and the Plight of the “Artist” .....	11
Habermas and Hegemony.....	17
Notes.....	26
II. <i>LE PRODUCTEUR</i> AND THE ART OF PUBLIC DISCOURSE.....	30
Prelude: The Founding of <i>Le Producteur</i> and its Context .....	32
<i>Le Producteur</i> and the Role of the Artist .....	39
Art as a Facet of Public Discourse .....	49
The Corruption of the Public Sphere.....	57
Achieving Concord.....	65
Conclusion.....	69
Epilogue: The Folding of <i>Le Producteur</i> .....	72
Notes.....	74
III. THE ARTIST AS EDUCATOR: THE EXPERIENCE OF HIPPOLYTE CARNOT.....	80
A Family Connection .....	82
Joining the School .....	88
The Exposition of the Doctrine: 1828-1830.....	105
a. The First Year: The Artist as Moral Educator.....	105
b. The Second Year: The Cult of Authority .....	115
Carnot’s Break with Enfantin and <i>La Revue Encyclopédique</i> .....	119
Carnot as Politician .....	126
After 1848: The <i>Mémoires</i> .....	134
Epilogue: President Carnot and the Saint-Simonian Republic.....	136
Conclusion.....	139
Notes.....	139
IV. CONCLUSION: EDUCATION, HEGEMONY AND SAINT-SIMONIANISM .....	147
Notes.....	152
REFERENCES CITED.....	153



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The early 19th century French social reformers known as the Saint-Simonians have traditionally been classified by intellectual historians as “utopian socialists.” Relative to the various other theorists and movements typically grouped under this category, the Saint-Simonians have been viewed as conspicuously “technocratic” in their celebration of the social importance of bankers and engineers. More troubling, the Saint-Simonians’ insistence upon the need for unity and centralized direction in all forms of social activity, including spiritual, cultural and intellectual life, has led to their condemnation by some intellectual historians as “theorists of the modern totalitarian state.” In contrast to these characterizations, the following thesis identifies the appeal made by the Saint-Simonians to contemporary men of letters. This appeal was in fact related to the Saint-Simonians’ concern for unity and direction in public discourse, which can be understood to some extent as a legitimate response to the prevailing state of what Jürgen Habermas has termed the “public sphere.” In manifesting such concern for unity and direction, moreover, the Saint-Simonians can be understood as arguing not for totalitarian domination of public life, but rather the need for what Antonio Gramsci described as “hegemony.”

#### **Saint-Simonianism as a Movement**

In the wake of his relatively obscure demise in 1825, a small circle of followers dedicated to the late Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon, took it upon themselves to disseminate their master’s largely unknown and unappreciated teachings and to transform society in a manner conducive to his proto-socialist vision, such as they understood it.

Falling increasingly under the leadership and authority of Prosper Enfantin and Saint-Amand Bazard over the next several years, the Saint-Simonians ultimately conceived of themselves as the progenitors of a new religion, co-opting much of the structure and terminology of the Catholic Church and spreading a gospel of social and economic reform through a combination of private correspondence, public lectures and “preachings,” as well as official printed organs (First *Le Producteur* from 1825-26, then *L’Organisateur* from 1829-31, and finally *Le Globe* from 1830-32). Between 1829 and 1832, at the height of their success as an organized movement, the Saint-Simonians could claim tens of thousands of adherents, making their presence felt most conspicuously in the crowded *quartiers* of Paris where Saint-Simon had spent most of his life. At this particular place and time, as the historian and socialist Louis Blanc wrote in 1841, “The stage was occupied entirely by the Saint-Simonian school.”

With an intrepidity without equal, with a vigor sustained by high talent and deep study, this school bared all the wounds of the century. It overthrew a thousand prejudices, it shook deep convictions, it opened to intelligence a new and vast career. The influence it exercised was great and lasts still.<sup>1</sup>

During this peak period, Saint-Simonian missionaries traveled abroad and attracted considerable attention (both positive and negative) in England, Germany, and especially in Belgium, where, amidst the tumult of revolution, they drew crowds numbering in the thousands.<sup>2</sup> Within France, as well, the Saint-Simonians dispatched missions in all directions. They enjoyed their greatest successes in the South and in the East in such cities as Toulouse, Limoges, Nancy, Metz, but above all in Lyon, which became the “second capital of the movement.”<sup>3</sup> At least some of the tenets of Saint-Simonianism found a particular resonance among the Lyonnais silk workers, whose revolt in the

autumn of 1831 was attributed by many contemporaries, however justifiably, to Saint-Simonian influence.<sup>4</sup> In the wake of the Lyon uprising, the incipient July Monarchy came to regard Saint-Simonianism as a threat to its stability and began looking for an opportunity to curb the movement's momentum.

At the same time as tensions were mounting and finally erupting in Lyon, the Saint-Simonian church itself was undergoing a painful schism which would ultimately represent a critical turning point in the movement's fortunes. In the summer of 1831, Enfantin began espousing notions of gender and marital relations which were largely (mis)understood by some Saint-Simonians and by the broader public as supporting the "community of women."<sup>5</sup> It was in relation to these notions that Enfantin encountered an irreconcilable disagreement with his fellow "Supreme Father," Saint-Amand Bazard. In November, after a long series of bitter arguments and failed attempts at compromise, Bazard finally decided to withdraw from the movement along with many other prominent members of the Saint-Simonian leadership. For the better part of the following year, Enfantin was able to exercise undivided control over the considerable body of adherents that remained. In the summer of 1832, however, Enfantin and several of his closest associates were indicted, tried, and ultimately convicted for "outrages against public morality committed in writings printed and distributed,"<sup>6</sup> as well as violating Article 291 of the penal code concerning the regulation of political associations and public assembly. While serving his brief prison sentence, Enfantin largely abandoned the leadership role he had so assiduously cultivated, leaving the Saint-Simonian movement in considerable disarray.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, upon his release in August of 1833, Enfantin retained enough clout to organize a modest Saint-Simonian expedition to Egypt in the hopes of persuading

the reigning viceroy, Mehmet Ali, of both the wisdom and feasibility of constructing a canal that would connect the Red Sea to the Mediterranean. Instead, the viceroy put the intrepid volunteers to work building a dam on the Nile, a project which was not nearly as conducive to the Saint-Simonians' lofty aspirations and on which several members of the expedition died. Frustrated and disheartened, Enfantin's remaining followers steadily drifted away from the "Supreme Father" in order to tend to more personal concerns and endeavors.<sup>8</sup> By 1840 the movement had effectively disbanded and in 1841 Louis Blanc could safely write about the Saint-Simonians in the past tense.

Even by the most generous estimations, Saint-Simonianism as an organized movement endured for little more than a decade. Its ideology, however, retained a formative influence on the many "*anciens saint-simoniens*" who would go on to occupy prominent positions in French government, science, industry and finance during the later years of the July Monarchy and especially under the Second Empire. Emperor Napoleon III himself was described by one contemporary intellectual as "a Saint-Simonian on horseback."<sup>9</sup> In their heyday, the Saint-Simonians had been so successful at publicizing the name of their erstwhile mentor that by the time *The Communist Manifesto* was first published in 1848, Marx and Engels could cite the system of Saint-Simon foremost among the varieties of "Critical-Utopian" socialism devised prior to their own "scientific" brand.<sup>10</sup> The name "Saint-Simon" has occupied this particular cubbyhole in the canon of western intellectual history ever since.

### **Saint-Simonianism as an Ideology**

While it may be common practice to categorize Saint-Simonianism as a variety of "utopian socialism," it is in certain respects misleading. Their objectives were certainly

of a different nature than those of the other movements and theorists Marx and Engels labeled “utopian.” They did not flee the great urban centers of Europe and attempt to construct ideal microcosms of human interaction from the ground up as, for instance, Robert Owen did in New Harmony, Indiana. The Saint-Simonians did not think on the level of the isolated community, but rather on the level of the nation, the continent, and the globe. They were concerned less with building a world of their own invention than with changing the world in which they already lived. Many of the means they envisioned for effecting such change, like the construction of the Suez Canal, ultimately did just that. Similarly, the label “socialist” must also be applied to the Saint-Simonian movement with a modest degree of caution. Certainly none of the active members of the movement would have described themselves as such, seeing as the very term “socialism” was not coined until 1834. It was, however, a former Saint-Simonian, Pierre Leroux, who coined it.<sup>11</sup> To the extent that the word “socialist” fairly applies to anyone who lived and wrote prior to the mid-1830s, it certainly applies to Saint-Simon and his followers.

The precise relationship between the Count of Saint-Simon and the members of the school, movement, and religion who adopted him as their namesake after his death has been disputed by subsequent generations of scholars. Frank Manuel, for instance, in his work on the concept of historical progress as it developed in France during the late 18th and early 19th centuries, chooses to deal with Saint-Simon and the Saint-Simonians completely distinctly from one another and thinks

This discrimination is justified by the consideration that the Saint-Simonians, whose identity was established only after the death of their master, introduced appreciable variations in historical, social, and religious thought beyond the ideas of the man from whom they had originally drawn their inspiration.<sup>12</sup>

To a significant extent, the Saint-Simonians could not help but draw selectively from their master's teachings and engage in a lengthy process of "filling in the blanks." Saint-Simon's body of writing, such as he left it, presented a bewildering array of semi-developed lines of thought trending in what often appeared to be contradictory directions. This character of his work was one of the reasons Saint-Simon had found success so elusive during his lifetime, and it posed a serious obstacle even to his closest disciples and admirers. Enfantin, recommending the works of Saint-Simon to a friend in 1825, felt the need to add a word of caution: "I think, by experience," he wrote, "that you will be little satisfied by the bizarre form in which Saint-Simon often presented his opinions."<sup>13</sup>

Saint-Simon's thought nonetheless possessed a number of main thrusts that were relatively easy to discern and which were readily adopted by his followers. Both Saint-Simon and his disciples were principally concerned with the problem of social discord and disorder. The philosophy of the 18th Century leading up to the French Revolution had apparently left the world a heap of shards. Liberal republicanism had brought down an *ancien regime* whose time had clearly come, but had failed to erect a viable alternative in its place. Saint-Simon aspired to guide the world to a new and better era free of war, poverty, and uncertainty. His conception of society can be described as decidedly "organismic," as opposed to "atomistic."<sup>14</sup> That is to say, he viewed society not as a collection of isolated egotistical individuals whose private pursuits the state was established to safeguard, but rather as a vast organism in which every person lived as a cell, each with his or her own specialized role to fulfill in the common interest. By the end of his career, Saint-Simon had followed the inspiration of the physiologist Marie Francois Xavier Bichat and identified three essential functions to be carried out within

the social organism: the “motor” function, the “rational” function, and the “emotive” function. Those individuals serving the first function included manual laborers and all those actively involved in directing their productive activities. Scientists served the second function while artists and religious leaders served the third. Those who did not serve any of these functions were “*oisifs*” or “idlers” who were essentially nothing more than destructive parasites on society. These included the landed aristocracy, government bureaucrats, military professionals, and lawyers, whose very existence was merely the regrettable legacy of war and discord. According to Saint-Simon, the members of these groups were primarily driven by the will to dominate, a basic human instinct which, when exercised by one man upon another, formed the basis of all human conflict. *Oisifs* were thus both the principal cause and the principal product of conflict. In a healthy, peaceful society, (clearly in contrast to the one in which Saint-Simon and his followers lived) *oisifs* would find no place. The productive classes would be able to manage perfectly well without them. The way to achieve such a society, however, was not through violent revolution (violence only bred chaos and more violence) but rather by gradually redirecting the destructive impulse of men to dominate each other towards the constructive impulse of men to cooperate with each other in order to dominate nature.<sup>15</sup> This gradual redirection was the principal task facing those fulfilling society’s “emotive” function.

Whereas in his early writings, Saint-Simon had awarded primary leadership in his projected society to scientists (like Plato, he believed that reason ought to dominate emotional and bodily instincts) by the end of his career Saint-Simon had “dethroned” science. Troubled by the widespread complacency he observed in the French scientific

community during Napoleon's catastrophic tenure as dictator,<sup>16</sup> Saint-Simon came to believe that scientists required the moral guidance of those with a more human touch. Ultimately, Saint-Simon imagined an arrangement in which artists would be entrusted with the task of conceptualizing the ends toward which society ought to direct its efforts as well as that of persuading the other members of society to that effect. The savants would then determine how to go about achieving those ends and the industrials would proceed as they were directed by the other two groups.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, in his final treatise, *The New Christianity*, Saint-Simon diagnosed the need for society to undergo a new religious awakening. Since the 15th century, Saint-Simon argued, Christianity had strayed from its original foundation: the principle that "men should behave toward one another like brothers."<sup>18</sup> The "New Christianity" ought to return to this principle and essentially serve to inspire all members of society to direct their efforts in common to the benefit of the "poorest and most numerous classes."<sup>19</sup>

Nowhere in Saint-Simon's system did the state come into play. In fact, for Saint-Simon, the bureaucratic and military apparatus of the state represented the most overbearing of wasteful and unproductive forces. Saint-Simon was decidedly of the opinion that "a government was best when it governed least and most cheaply."<sup>20</sup> A man of his time, Saint-Simon was fascinated by the voluntary associations among private individuals that seemed to be emerging everywhere in early 19th century society, particularly those associations that administered economic and financial activity: banks, insurance companies, savings societies, and canal construction companies. "These administered societies," as Manuel writes, "were models for the total society of the future." In this vein, whenever he described his projected society, Saint-Simon preferred



to make use of the term “administration” rather than “government.”<sup>21</sup> “Administration” essentially entailed establishing a definite hierarchy within each productive class that would impart unity and direction to that class’s particular activities. Each member of each class would find his proper place in the hierarchy according to his talents, direct and judge the actions of his inferiors and accept the direction and judgment of his superiors. There would be no conflict or resentment within each of the classes because the hierarchy would be completely transparent and merit-based; it would be readily apparent to each member that under no other social arrangement could he reasonably hope to climb any higher than where his talents had already placed him. There would be no conflict between the classes because each would be defined by talents both completely distinct and yet fundamentally complementary to one another; each class would accept the primacy of the others in each one’s proper sphere of activity and it would be obvious that cooperation was in everyone’s best interest.<sup>22</sup> Without conflict the state would lose its *raison d’être* and would slowly “wither away.” Thus the “government of men would give way to the administration of things” (although Saint-Simon never used these particular Marxist turns of phrase himself).<sup>23</sup>

Saint-Simon never made especially clear how his ideal society was to be brought into being; that was a problem dealt with at much greater length by the subsequent generation of Saint-Simonian theorists. Central among the Saint-Simonians’ specific proposals was that the right of inheritance be abolished and that a central bank be made the sole heir to all productive property. As this bank acquired control over an ever greater proportion of all available capital, it would become increasingly capable of directing the economic activities of society in the interests of the “poorest and most

numerous classes,” thus minimizing social strife and instability. It would be able to finance massive public works projects that would include canals and railways on a grander scale than anyone had ever before dreamed possible. Not only would such projects serve to reduce unemployment, but they would also eliminate barriers to trade and communication and help bring peace to the world. In light of these specific proposals, Saint-Simonianism has long been understood to have appealed primarily to the pride of bankers and engineers (Enfantin was both). As a result, the Saint-Simonians have frequently been described as the most “technocratic” of the utopian socialists.

The Saint-Simonians’ most significant innovation, however, pertained to the issue of religion. Drawing their inspiration from *The New Christianity*, which they regarded as Saint-Simon’s most important work, the Saint-Simonians ultimately went a step further. For the Saint-Simonians, Christianity was and had always been inadequate to the extent that it had condemned the material world (the world of the flesh) as inherently sinful. What the world needed was not a new variety of Christianity more faithful to its roots, but a new religion entirely: a pantheistic religion that could effectively extend the purview of moral authority into the realm of material production. Saint-Simonianism itself would serve as this religion. The Saint-Simonians envisioned a society in which all those representing the “emotive” or “sympathetic” faculty would be regimented into a hierarchical priesthood, the supreme head of which would ultimately direct not only the practice of the arts, but those of industry and the sciences as well. This high priest would serve as the “living law,” the foundation of authority on which society would finally be able to firmly rest.

## **The Question of Totalitarianism and the Plight of the “Artist”**

Even such an abridged survey of the Saint-Simonians’ more notable tenets serves to suggest some of the obvious reasons why many of their critics—both at the time of the Saint-Simonians’ career as an organized movement and over the nearly two centuries since—have accused them of exhibiting dangerously authoritarian tendencies. Certainly their fundamental abhorrence of discord and disorder of any kind, along with their concomitant fixation on unity, direction, and hierarchy would seem to point in that direction. Their lack of faith in the rule of written law and their enthusiasm for the notion of a “living law,” a single individual who would direct virtually all human activity, amount to considerable icing on the cake. It was on this account, in the wake of the Second World War, amidst rising Cold War tensions and the prominence of the “totalitarianism thesis” during the 1950s, that the Saint-Simonians attracted significant negative attention among western scholars. In the introduction to his 1958 English translation of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition*, a series of public lectures delivered by the Saint-Simonians between 1828 and 1830, Georg Iggers wrote that “Until recently, the Saint-Simonians have been dismissed as ineffectual social reformers. But today they emerge as theorists of the modern totalitarian state whose doctrine subtly assisted in its establishment.”<sup>24</sup>

For those who would accuse them of totalitarianism, the Saint-Simonians’ emphasis on the need for unity, direction and hierarchy is most objectionable as it pertains to those members of society fulfilling what the Saint-Simonians variously termed the “emotive,” “sympathetic,” “sentimental,” or “moral” function, i.e. those members of society referred to by the Saint-Simonians as “artists.” It was, for example, on the basis of

the Saint-Simonians' projected control and use of the fine arts for the purposes of reinforcing a particular social order and authority that Hannah Arendt drew an explicit comparison between *Enfantin* and Joseph Goebbels.<sup>25</sup> The objection to Saint-Simonianism on this account is based more fully, however, on the fact that the Saint-Simonians used the term "artist" to refer to anyone whose vocation was fundamentally communicative. This meant not only painters, sculptors, composers, musicians and actors, but also religious leaders, schoolteachers, and writers of any kind, including journalists. To impose unity, direction, and hierarchy on "artists" would therefore seem to entail imposing strict limits upon freedom of belief and above all upon freedom of expression.

This specific objection to Saint-Simonianism is hardly the invention of 20th century historians. It was in fact one of the more common objections raised against the Saint-Simonian movement from its inception. As early as 1826, the arch-liberal polemicist, novelist, and politician Benjamin Constant accused Saint-Simon's followers of attempting to imitate "the priests of Memphis and Thebes," that is, of hoping to impose the crudest and most brutal form of theocratic dictatorship.<sup>26</sup> The Saint-Simonians' consistent and oft-repeated response to Constant and to all those who voiced similar concerns was to insist upon their disavowal of all violent means of political action and government coercion. As Saint-Amand Bazard explained, "not only did we not at all mean that, at some future time, it would be necessary to once again constrain the activity of the spirits, to reestablish the inquisition over thought, or to guarantee public doctrines with legal penalties, but even that such consequences would be in formal contradiction with the doctrine that we profess."<sup>27</sup> Unity, direction and hierarchy in the realm of

thought, belief, and expression would be achieved much the same way it would be achieved in the realm of material production: through peaceful persuasion and voluntary association. Neither Constant nor the intellectual historians of the 1950s found this response particularly reassuring. As Constant wrote, any attempt to impose unity on thought, belief, and expression “in whatever manner that you organize it, will never be but an inquisition.”<sup>28</sup> It was very well and good, after all, for the Saint-Simonians to condemn violent repression and coercion while not having the means to engage in it. Had they ever managed to acquire such means, however, they would have been neither the first nor the last group of radical activists to ultimately adopt methods they had once claimed to abhor. How could the Saint-Simonians honestly expect to attain the unity they sought without resorting to violent repression and coercion? Why would any “artist” be inclined to accept such constraints voluntarily?

While a liberal adversary of Saint-Simonianism might pose these two questions rhetorically, one might just as well pose them in earnest; the Saint-Simonians *did* in fact expect to attain unity without resorting to violent repression and coercion and there *were* in fact many prominent “artists” to be found among their ranks. The two questions might be conjoined and reformulated more precisely as follows: How did the Saint-Simonians conceptualize the mechanics of public discourse and the proper role of the “artist” with respect to that discourse such that the social and cultural conditions prevailing in France at the time might have led a contemporary “artist” to find Saint-Simonianism appealing?

Cultural historian William Reddy suggests some of the essential context underlying the emergence of Saint-Simonianism in his article, “Condottieri of the Pen: Journalists and the Public Sphere in Postrevolutionary France (1815-1850)”. In this

article, Reddy describes the unfortunate situation faced by one particular variety of “artists” during the period in which Saint-Simonianism was most active. While the French periodical press had undergone an enormous efflorescence after the fall of Napoleon, in most respects Restoration-era journalists found themselves no better off than their 18th century predecessors, the “Grub Street Hacks,” studied at great length by Robert Darnton. Reddy asserts that what Darnton writes of the “Poor devils” who attempted to scratch (or scribble) livings as writers in the autumn years of the *ancien regime*, that they “could not afford to be consistent... they put themselves up for hire and wrote whatever was ordered by the highest bidder, when they were fortunate enough to sell themselves,”<sup>29</sup> remained perfectly descriptive of French journalists in the 1820s, 30s and 40s. The principal difference between the two generations was that whereas the former had served at the beck and call of prominent aristocrats, the latter catered to the whims and interests of political parties. In reference to this phenomenon, Alfred Nettement, one of the editors of the Parisian daily newspaper *La Quotidienne*, declared that

despite their pretension to direct the movements of their parties, almost always, [journalists] are followers. The pens that appear so free, so independent, are chained by a thousand secret ties.... Apart from a few *honorable* exceptions, it is difficult to comprehend the enslavement of the press on this point. Journalists must humor prejudices they do not share, espouse passions they condemn, and take into account a thousand petty feelings and ideas that they know to be ridiculous.<sup>30</sup>

In the realm of cultural criticism as well, Reddy points out, the commercialization of the press seemed to presage an inexorable decline in the sincerity and integrity of journalistic discourse. The reviews of new works of art, literature, and theatrical productions that occupied the *feuilletons* and back pages of newspapers were often little more than

advertisements bought and paid for by those with a vested interest in those works' commercial success.<sup>31</sup> Thus, the practice of journalism in post-revolutionary France presented a double paradox. First, at the same time that public opinion and the media that shaped it seemed a more potent cultural and political force than ever before, journalists themselves seemed completely powerless. On another level of irony, during a time of unprecedented freedom of expression (at least in France) the sincerity of the views expressed by those most active in public discourse was increasingly suspect.

For Reddy, *Nettement's* use of the word "honorable" is of particular significance because it relates the practice of journalism in early 19th century France with contemporary notions of masculine honor and dignity, notions which were in the process of acquiring far greater weight and currency across an increasingly broad swath of the French population.<sup>32</sup> "By 1840 or so," writes Reddy, "few young men could have contemplated a career in journalism without being aware that a requirement of the job was the concealment of their true opinions—often... to the point of avoiding the formulation of clear opinions—and that this ran counter to a public expectation that honorable speech be sincere."<sup>33</sup> Thus, at the same time that journalism was employing (or at least partially employing) a growing proportion of educated young Frenchmen, it was increasingly regarded as a dishonorable vocation. The publisher *Émile de Girardin*, speaking before Parliament in 1836, made a set of scathing remarks on the state of the journalistic profession which he subsequently (and somewhat ironically) put into print. Compelled by desperate financial circumstances, Girardin claimed,

newspapers often have no other method of acquiring a large enough readership except to multiply political disputes and social antipathies, to occasionally bring exasperation to the mind, suspicion to the conscience, by means of systematic bad faith, by inaccuracy, on both sides, in

reporting on the parliament, and by mutual injustice in the pursuit of attacks wherever the other side appears vulnerable.<sup>34</sup>

Journalists did little to improve their collective reputation when, wary of attaching themselves too strongly to definite positions that might fall out of popularity at any moment, they filled their columns with insults rather than principled debate. With a writer's personal honor already so tenuous and at so high a premium, duels begun with the pen were often concluded with the sword or the pistol. Dueling became an endemic practice among journalists, so much so that "a willingness to duel was therefore essential to the journalist who did not want to be taken for a liar or a coward."<sup>35</sup> French journalism at this time could thus be fairly described as a murderous business.

In describing the heightened importance attached by early 19th century French society to notions of honor and dignity, Reddy makes a passing but tantalizing reference to the Saint-Simonians. The Saint-Simonians, Reddy explains, were among the very few during this period to seriously reevaluate such received notions and conventions. In the midst of his discussion of the importance of familial honor in the arrangement of marriages, Reddy includes a footnote in which he remarks that "Prosper Enfantin, like a number of others, was drawn to Saint-Simonian socialism in part because his father's bankruptcy had prevented him both from winning an officer's commission and from making an advantageous marriage."<sup>36</sup> Enfantin was not a journalist, and Reddy is essentially only interested in the Saint-Simonians insofar as they represent a conspicuous exception to the broader cultural trends he identifies. Nonetheless, Reddy's reference implicitly raises the question of what appeal Saint-Simonianism might have had among contemporary journalists. Journalists working during the 1820s and 1830s were surrounded with the discord and confusion which the Saint-Simonians condemned so



vociferously. Amidst their intense and desperate competition for both readers and financial backing, early 19th century French journalists were well aware that ostensible freedom of expression could be illusory. An alternative model of public discourse, one in which journalists would not have to fight tooth and nail (and sometimes pistol) with one another, one in which they would rather occupy a position of respect and dignity, would have had considerable appeal.

### **Habermas and Hegemony**

One of Reddy's principal objectives in describing the realities of early 19th century French journalism is to engage critically with the concept and historical treatment of the "public sphere" famously elaborated by Jürgen Habermas. Before attempting to describe the "model of public discourse" proposed by the Saint-Simonians, Habermas's "Public Sphere" is a conceptual apparatus that demands exposition. In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas poses the question of how and when the entity known as public opinion came to exercise both a moral and practical check on the actions of government. He pursues this question by tracing the historical development of the various social, cultural, and political conditions and institutions that together permit, facilitate and frame public discourse as well as enable that discourse to affect social and political realities in turn. Habermas refers to this set of conditions and institutions as the "public sphere," that is, the arena in which public discourse is carried out and in which public opinion effectively takes shape. According to Habermas, the modern public sphere began its development in Western Europe during the 17th century, when the expansion of early modern capitalism and the early modern state prompted the inception of modern journalism. He goes on to attribute great importance to the subsequent

emergence of several new social milieus during the late 17th and early 18th centuries including coffee houses (in England especially), salons (in France) and the *Tischgesellschaften* (in Germany) all of which “organized discussion among private people that tended to be ongoing.”<sup>37</sup> These were milieus characterized by “voluntary association,” in which participants of varying social standing intermingled and in which one’s ability to argue effectively and to demonstrate learned judgment were what mattered. The public sphere that emerged during the 18th century was thus in some sense both the implicit product and inherent advocate of an egalitarian and emancipatory social agenda. Habermas makes the claim that the critical discourse carried on in this early public sphere originally pertained exclusively to art and literature, but gradually expanded to include matters of state as well. Thus, by elaborating the concept of the public sphere, Habermas is able to draw an extended series of relations between a wide variety of historical social, cultural, and political phenomena.

According to Habermas’s historical narrative, the public sphere reached the pinnacle of its development—meaning that public opinion was able to exercise its greatest moral and practical authority—during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The public sphere prevailing during this period represented (for the most part) the realization of liberal Enlightenment ideals, which Habermas takes to have been articulated most succinctly by Immanuel Kant in his essay, “What is Enlightenment?” Kant begins this essay by defining the shameful state of “tutelage” as “man’s inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another.” He then defines enlightenment as the escape from such a condition and goes on to explain that, “For any single individual to work himself out of the life of tutelage which has become almost his nature is very

difficult.... But that the public should enlighten itself is more possible; indeed, if only freedom is granted, enlightenment is almost sure to follow.”<sup>38</sup> Enlightenment liberalism thus maintains that the pursuit of understanding is most facilitated by a free and public discussion among rational and autonomous individuals. In order to govern wisely and ethically, therefore, the state ought to both respect as much as possible the freedom of such public discourse as well as defer to the conclusions reached by that discourse, i.e. to public opinion. Habermas’s central point is that public discourse can only be rational and autonomous and public opinion can only exercise both a practical and moral authority under a specific set of conditions, that is to say, only so long as the “public sphere” retains a particular “structure.”

Habermas devotes the second half of *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* to the first half of its title. Beginning in the second half and especially the last quarter of the 19th century, according to Habermas, the public sphere underwent a massive transformation, and not for the better. The consequences of industrialization and the ongoing development of capitalism in general compelled the state to mediate social conflicts in a variety of new ways, including providing public services that had never before been public. Conversely, business concerns emerged that were much larger and more complex than had ever existed before, and these began to assume functions previously held within the province of public authorities. This “interpenetration of state and society,” as Habermas calls it, led to the innovation of a host of practices and institutions which had a decidedly negative impact on the integrity of public discourse. Large business concerns began to shape public opinion in a decidedly under-handed fashion through the practice of “public relations” in which “the sender of the message

hides his business intentions in the role of someone interested in the public welfare.”<sup>39</sup> Special interest associations inserted themselves insidiously into the political decision-making process, which increasingly took place behind closed doors and to which public discussion was increasingly ancillary. Politics assumed a plebiscitary character as professional politicians treated the public not as an arena for ongoing critical debate, but as something to be mobilized on periodic occasions for the purposes of obtaining “acclamatory assent.”<sup>40</sup> In this structurally-transformed public sphere, Habermas asserts, “the criteria of rationality are completely lacking.”<sup>41</sup>

Habermas’s strikingly negative depiction of the late 19th and 20th century public sphere presents an admirable catalogue of the various factors that can preclude or at least greatly hamper the coherence and effectiveness of public discourse. It also serves to reinforce both implicitly and explicitly his strikingly rosy depiction of the structurally-transformed public sphere’s late 18th and early 19th century predecessor. To claim that the public sphere became irrational and corrupt as part of a “structural transformation” would seem to imply a prior set of conditions under which public discourse was rational and sincere, or at least considerably more so. This implication is readily apparent in Habermas’s presentation of the history of journalism, which strongly resembles a fall from grace. He describes how journalism, in its earliest form, had taken the form of a small handicraft business. During this first phase the publisher had been solely concerned with turning a modest profit by organizing and collating the news. With the development of the public sphere, however, the press entered a distinct second phase: that of “literary journalism,” in which the publisher “changed from being a merchant of news to being a dealer in public opinion.” “At this point,” according to Habermas, “the

commercial purpose of such enterprises receded almost entirely into the background; indeed, violating all the rules of profitability, they often were money losers from the start. The pedagogical and later increasingly political impulse could be financed, so to speak, by bankruptcy.”<sup>42</sup> Prior to the mid-19th century, he claims, advertising played only a marginal role in the practice of journalism. “In the eighteenth century,” according to Habermas, “advertisements occupied only about one-twentieth of the space in the advertising or intelligence journals; furthermore, they concerned almost exclusively curiosities, that is, unusual commodities.” In most lines of business, advertising was actually considered a “disreputable” practice.<sup>43</sup> The mid-19th century, however, witnessed the invention of the advertising agency, and journalism once again assumed the form of a for-profit industry. In order to increase circulation among a wider readership (and thus increase advertising revenue), newspapers decreased the sophistication of their writing and depoliticized their content. Habermas asserts that “The history of the big daily papers in the second half of the nineteenth century proves that the press itself became manipulable to the extent that it became commercialized.”<sup>44</sup> Thus Habermas suggests that prior to the second half of the 19th century the press was neither commercialized nor manipulable.

Reddy has been far from alone among social and cultural historians in criticizing Habermas’s depiction of the late 18th and early 19th century public sphere (and by extension, the classic liberal Enlightenment ideal of public discourse) as basically unrealistic not only with regard to France specifically, but also more generally. As Geoff Eley puts it, “[Habermas’s] conception of the public sphere amounts to an ideal of critical liberalism that remains historically unattained.”<sup>45</sup> Among the many objections that have

been expressed by historians in this vein is that Habermas imagines the public sphere of the late 18th and early 19th centuries to have been far more rational and egalitarian than was actually the case. In his article, “Reason and Passion in the Public Sphere: Habermas and the Cultural Historians,” John L. Brooke surveys the significant body of scholarship demonstrating the extent to which “‘rationality’ cannot capture the essence of life in public.” Brooke concludes that American public life during the late 18th and early 19th centuries in particular “must be understood through its ‘performance’ of symbol and ritual, of demonstrations, of parades, of celebration, and of protest... it required the swaying of emotions and the mobilization of intangible feelings.”<sup>46</sup> Referring not only to *The Structural Transformation*, but also to Habermas’s more recent work, Brooke expects that “Historians and philosophers alike will continue to see Habermas’s avoidance of the affective and emotional dimensions as impossibly utopian.”<sup>47</sup>

Similarly, much attention has been called to the extent to which the institutions of the late 18th and early 19th century public sphere served a social agenda that was not necessarily emancipatory or egalitarian. Eley, for instance, describes specifically how in German towns and cities during the early 19th century, groups of bourgeois notables often formed exclusive associations, “usually called something like Harmony, Concordia, Ressource, or Union,”<sup>48</sup> which would organize various civic and philanthropic activities and thus serve to reinforce the notables’ moral authority in the community. Casting a somewhat wider net, Eley asserts that

The formation of Birmingham’s later-eighteenth-century associational networks, the creation of an elite club in early-nineteenth-century German small towns, and the creation of literary societies in mid-nineteenth-century Bohemia all involved questions of interest, prestige, and power, as well as those of rational communication.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, in articulating a model of public discourse in contrast with the one upheld by Enlightenment liberalism and articulated by Habermas, an alternative model that recognized the essential “emotive” dimension of public discourse as well as its inherent power dynamics, the Saint-Simonians may be credited with a considerable degree of realism.

In pointing to the ways in which the public sphere has always offered a means for a particular social group to assert its authority and exercise control over others, Eley suggests the interpretive usefulness of integrating the concept of the public sphere with Antonio Gramsci’s concept of “hegemony.” An appreciation of this concept, I want to suggest, is essential for grasping the fundamental concern and objective of the Saint-Simonians, as well as their understanding of the role of the “artist” in shaping public discourse. Gwyn A. Williams defines hegemony succinctly as

An order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and political principles, and all social relations, particularly in their intellectual and moral connotation.<sup>50</sup>

Hegemony is essentially a subtle form of control exercised by the dominant group in society as a result of which it becomes increasingly difficult to articulate or even imagine alternative social arrangements in such a way as to pose a serious threat to the status quo.<sup>51</sup>

Hegemony, however, is not a totalitarian concept. In his *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci introduces the term “hegemony” to refer to the form of control particular to the “superstructural level” of “civil society,”<sup>52</sup> a term which Eley considers essentially homologous to Habermas’s “public sphere.”<sup>53</sup> The purpose of hegemony, Gramsci

explains, is to generate “the ‘spontaneous’ consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group.” Gramsci defines the apparatus of social hegemony in explicit contrast to “the apparatus of state coercive power which ‘legally’ enforces discipline on those groups who do not ‘consent’ either actively or passively.”<sup>54</sup> From the standpoint of the dominant group, acquiring and maintaining access to the coercive apparatus of the state is of a decidedly secondary importance compared to acquiring and maintaining hegemony. On the one hand, no group can hope to gain control of the state without first being able to exercise hegemony.<sup>55</sup> On the other, the coercive apparatus of the state serves essentially as a last resort “in anticipation of moments of crisis of command and direction when spontaneous consent has failed,”<sup>56</sup> that is to say, for moments when hegemony is weak or tenuous. In fact, Gramsci suggests that government tends to become most coercive and repressive at precisely those moments when the hegemony of the dominant group is most in doubt.<sup>57</sup> Conversely, should the dominant group’s hegemony ever become strong enough, “It is possible to imagine the coercive element of the State withering away by degrees.”<sup>58</sup>

Although according to Gramsci the dominant group in society is able to exercise hegemony largely as a result of its “position and function in the world of production,”<sup>59</sup> as Eley puts it, hegemony “is not a fixed and immutable condition” but rather “requires the arts of persuasion, a continuous labor of creative ideological intervention.”<sup>60</sup> In effect, this continuous labor is entrusted to those members of society Gramsci classifies as “intellectuals,” who essentially serve as hegemony’s “functionaries.”<sup>61</sup> Within this category Habermas includes priests,<sup>62</sup> teachers,<sup>63</sup> artists, journalists, and men of letters



more generally.<sup>64</sup> In carrying out their essential social function, Gramsci describes the intellectuals as manifesting an *esprit de corps* and a degree of hierarchy reminiscent of military organization, with those at the top exercising influence and authority over those below.<sup>65</sup> Gramsci at one point goes so far as to describe an especially prominent contemporary Italian intellectual, Benedetto Croce, as “a kind of lay pope.”<sup>66</sup>

The Saint-Simonians, I want to suggest, developed a conception of “civil society”/ “the public sphere” essentially similar to Gramsci’s, that is, as fundamentally both susceptible to and even requiring the imposition of hegemony. The Saint-Simonians addressed and referred to the functionaries of this hegemony, roughly the same members of society Gramsci referred to as “Intellectuals,” as “Artists.” Although the parallels between Gramsci and the Saint-Simonians could be multiplied, one of their more notable divergences warrants specific mention. For Gramsci, as functionaries of hegemony, the Intellectuals essentially served as the dominant group’s “deputies.” Their function in society was thus “subaltern.”<sup>67</sup> “Subaltern” would hardly characterize the role attributed to the “artist” in the society projected by the Saint-Simonians. Although they would direct social activity in the interests of the “poorest and most numerous classes,” their place in society would be characterized by a profound dignity, and the hegemony they would implement would be as much their own as anyone else’s.

This, I hope to establish, represented the appeal of Saint-Simonianism not only to journalists, but to contemporary men of letters in general. In support of this interpretation, I will first provide an account of how the members of the nascent Saint-Simonian school conceptualized the figure of the “artist” in the pages of their first official journal, *Le Producteur*. By way of this conceptualization, I argue, the early Saint-

Simonians articulated both a particular understanding of the mechanics of public discourse as well as an implicit appeal to contemporary men of letters. I will then survey the life and career of Hippolyte Carnot, a particularly prominent example of a Saint-Simonian man of letters, in order to assess how both this appeal and this understanding were received as they developed in conjunction with Saint-Simonianism as an ideology. Through the efforts of Carnot and his colleagues, I suggest, Saint-Simonianism ultimately played an important role in the development of French public education and the consolidation of French democracy.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Louis Blanc, *Histoire de Dix Ans* (Paris: 1841), I, 95ff. Cited in Robert Carlisle, *The Proffered Crown: Saint-Simonianism and the Doctrine of Hope* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 113.

<sup>2</sup> Carlisle, 144-145.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 142-143, 136.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 227-229.

<sup>8</sup> Sébastien Charléty, *Histoire du Saint-Simonisme (1825-1864)* (Paris: Éditions Gonthier, 1931), 182-222

<sup>9</sup> An assessment variously attributed to Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve and to Adolphe Guérault. See Albert Leon Guerard, *French Prophets of Yesterday: A Study of Religious Thought Under the Second Empire* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1913), 207-208 and Carlisle, 146.

<sup>10</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999), 92.

<sup>11</sup> Bruno Viard, *Pierre Leroux: Penseur de l'Humanité* (Éditions Sulliver, 2009), 31.

<sup>12</sup> Frank Manuel, *The Prophets of Paris* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 2.

<sup>13</sup> Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon and Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin; *Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1865-1878), I, 156.

<sup>14</sup> Manuel, 127.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 122.

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., 118-119.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., 122.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., 139.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., 140.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., 135.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., 133.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., 134-135.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., 136.
- <sup>24</sup> Georg Iggers, "Introduction" in *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition*, trans. Georg G. Iggers (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), ix.
- <sup>25</sup> Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1951), 337.
- <sup>26</sup> Benjamin Constant, "L'Industrie et la Morale Considérées dans leur rapport avec la liberty; par Charles – Barthélemy Dunoyer, ancien rédacteur du Censeur européen; avec cette épigraphe: Nous ne devenons libres qu'en devenant industriels et moraux" *La Revue Encyclopédique* 29 (Jan.,-March, 1826): 435.
- <sup>27</sup> Saint-Amand Bazard, "De l'Esprit Critique" *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 120.
- <sup>28</sup> Constant, 434.
- <sup>29</sup> Robert Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1982), 115-16. Cited in William Reddy, "Condottieri of the Pen: Journalists and the Public Sphere in Postrevolutionary France (1815-1850)" *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (Dec., 1994): 1550.
- <sup>30</sup> Alfred Nettement, *La Presse Parisienne* (Paris, 1846), 89 cited in Reddy, 1551 Reddy's emphasis.
- <sup>31</sup> Reddy, 1553-1554.
- <sup>32</sup> On this point Reddy cites Robert A. Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (New York: 1993), 128-34.
- <sup>33</sup> Reddy, 1552.
- <sup>34</sup> Émile de Girardin, *De la Presse Périodique* (Paris: 1836), 14 cited in Reddy, 1551.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., 1556.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., 1548 f. 8.
- <sup>37</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991), 36.
- <sup>38</sup> Immanuel Kant, "What is Enlightenment," *On History* ed. and trans. Lewis White Beck (Indianapolis, 1957), 3-4 cited in Habermas, 104.

- 
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid., 193.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid., 201.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., 195.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., 182.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., 190.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid., 185.
- <sup>45</sup> Geoff Eley, "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century" in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992), 289.
- <sup>46</sup> John L. Brooke, "Reason and Passion in the Public Sphere: Habermas and the Cultural Historians" in *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29, no. 1 (Summer, 1998): 56.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid., 63.
- <sup>48</sup> Eley, 297.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid., 307.
- <sup>50</sup> Gwyn A. Williams, "The Concept of 'Egemonia' in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes in Interpretation," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 21 (1960): 587 cited in Eley, 322.
- <sup>51</sup> Eley, 323.
- <sup>52</sup> Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), 12.
- <sup>53</sup> Eley, 323.
- <sup>54</sup> Gramsci, 12.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid., 57.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., 12.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid., 60-61.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., 263.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., 12.
- <sup>60</sup> Eley, 323.
- <sup>61</sup> Gramsci, 12.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid., 7.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., 104.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid., 9.

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 12-13.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 12.

## CHAPTER II

### *LE PRODUCTEUR* AND THE ART OF PUBLIC DISCOURSE

The story of Saint-Simonianism begins with *Le Producteur*. Founded by the followers of Saint-Simon immediately after his death, this journal, which remained in active circulation for just over a year, represented the first attempt by the members of the nascent Saint-Simonian school to identify and articulate the main thrusts of their departed master's teachings in a manner they hoped would prove more appealing and accessible to a wider audience. This attempt was to some extent an abortive one; a broader Saint-Simonian following failed to materialize during the run of *Le Producteur*, and it ultimately proved a frustrating, exhausting, even humiliating experience for several members of its staff. Many of *Le Producteur*'s contributors, even some of the most prolific, would subsequently take no further part in the Saint-Simonian movement. This is one of several reasons why the career of *Le Producteur* is sometimes treated as essentially a prologue to the history of Saint-Simonianism proper. In addition, several of the more conspicuous features of Saint-Simonianism in its later and more mature form—its notion of the “living law,” its rigorous division of Western history into “critical” and “organic” epochs, and its self-conception and organization as a new religion on the model of the Catholic church—were not to be found in the pages of *Le Producteur*. Nonetheless, it was on *Le Producteur* that most of the principal leaders of the Saint-Simonian movement first met and collaborated, and it was through *Le Producteur* that many prominent disciples first encountered the ideas of the new school. An examination

of *Le Producteur* thus serves to suggest the character of at least the initial inspiration and appeal of Saint-Simonianism.

It was in the pages of *Le Producteur* that the Saint-Simonians first developed their conception of the artist and his proper role in society. Historian Philippe Régnier suggests in his article, “The Saint-Simonians, the Priest and the Artist,” that the Saint-Simonians appealed to contemporary artists insofar as they “maintained a public status for art.”<sup>1</sup> According to Régnier, however, this was not true of the Saint-Simonian movement at its inception. Originally, he argues, the society projected by the nascent Saint-Simonian school accorded only a passive role to the fine arts. This doctrine, he claims, was first reversed in July of 1826 when Philippe Buchez’s, “Several Reflections on Literature and the Fine Arts” appeared in *Le Producteur*.<sup>2</sup> Régnier attaches pivotal and seminal importance to this article, pointing to its considerable influence on subsequent Saint-Simonian treatises.<sup>3</sup> The following chapter demonstrates to the contrary that the contributors to *Le Producteur* reserved a role of creative importance for the figure of the “artist” from the journal’s first appearance, and that Buchez’s “Several Reflections,” while certainly remarkable, was merely more explicit in articulating themes readily appreciable in numerous earlier articles. Moreover, by expanding their concept of the artist to include journalists and men of letters more generally, and by bemoaning the contemporary state of “the fine arts,” the contributors were able not only to articulate a powerful appeal to a particular body of readers and potential disciples, but also to express a concern for what might be described as the corruption of the public sphere. The various responses they proposed for remedying this corruption indicate not so much an interest in

repressive authoritarian control of public discourse so much as in cooperation and solidarity among the members of a cultural elite, whether narrowly or broadly defined.

### **Prelude: The Founding of *Le Producteur* and its Context**

In early 1825, while his final work, *The New Christianity*, was in the process of publication, the Count of Saint-Simon conferred with four of his closest associates: his secretary, Léon Halévy, his most dedicated disciple, Olinde Rodrigues, and his friends and collaborators the doctor Etienne-Marin Bailly and the jurist Jean-Baptiste Marie Duvergier. The five men agreed that they would soon found a periodical publication for the purposes of elaborating and disseminating Saint-Simon's new ideas, and that this journal would be called, "*Le Producteur*."<sup>4</sup> The count died on May 19<sup>th</sup>, however, before the venture could advance far beyond the conceptual phase. The next day, Rodrigues circulated a note to all those who had collaborated with or otherwise assisted Saint-Simon in his final years proposing that the project of the journal be carried forward in the Count's absence.<sup>5</sup> The majority of those who attended Saint-Simon's funeral on May 22<sup>nd</sup> were supporters of the idea. Although Prosper Enfantin was not present at the funeral, he met with Rodrigues the next day to express his enthusiasm.<sup>6</sup>

*Le Producteur* was officially founded on June 1<sup>st</sup>, at which point fifty shares in the journal were sold at the price of 1,000 francs each.<sup>7</sup> Halévy, Rodrigues, Bailly and Duvergier were all among the initial investors. While the vast majority of the shareholders bought just one share apiece, both Rodrigues and Enfantin committed to three.<sup>8</sup> Both young men had experience working in finance, and the two would serve as joint general-managers of the company; each of the fifty shares in *Le Producteur* bore both of their signatures.<sup>9</sup> By far the largest investor, however, was the famous financier



Jacques Laffitte,<sup>\* 10</sup> who bought a 20% stake in the journal.<sup>11</sup> In addition to Laffitte, *Le Producteur* also enjoyed the backing of Jacques Ardoin, Guillaume-Louis Terneaux, and Jean-Pierre Basterrèche, all of whom were respected figures in French banking<sup>12</sup> whose names Enfantin did not hesitate to invoke in the letters he subsequently wrote to family and friends touting the respectability and viability of his new endeavor.<sup>13</sup>

Work on the journal began immediately and continued through the summer and into the fall, with the first issue of *Le Producteur* coming off the presses at the beginning of October.<sup>14</sup> Unlike later Saint-Simonian publications, *Le Producteur*, “Journal of Industry, the Sciences, and the Fine Arts,” did not mention Saint-Simon’s name in its subtitle. In fact, while “Saint-Simon” would ultimately appear very occasionally in the pages of *Le Producteur*, for a long time his name was conspicuously absent.

Nonetheless, the subtitle’s categorization of productive human activity into the trinity of industry, the sciences, and the fine arts clearly pointed to Saint-Simon’s influence.

Furthermore, the journal bore as an epigraph a quote easily attributable to the dearly departed Count: “The golden age, which a blind tradition has heretofore located in the past, is ahead of us.”<sup>15</sup> The devotion of *Le Producteur* to the articulation, at least very generally speaking, of a Saint-Simonian worldview was clear to all of its contributors and the vast majority of its readers.

---

\* Jacques Laffitte (1767-1844) was born the son of a provincial carpenter and rose quickly in the world of French banking after moving to Paris in 1788. In 1809, he was named Regent of the Bank of France. Before his exile to Saint Helena, Napoleon famously deposited five million francs with Laffitte, saying: “I know you, Mr. Laffitte: I know that you had no affection for my government, but I take you for an honest man.” During the occupation of Paris, Laffitte paid General Blücher 600,000 francs of his own money to keep the Prussian Commander from setting fire to the Hotel de Ville. After 1816, Laffitte served as one of the more notable liberal voices in the Chamber of Deputies. As President of the Chamber, he ultimately played an important role in the Revolution of 1830 and the establishment of the July Monarchy. Throughout his career, Laffitte was a noted philanthropist and patron of the arts. He took an interest in the work of Saint-Simon during the latter’s lifetime and was one of those who helped support the Count in his many times of need.

*Le Producteur*, like most new periodical publications appearing in Paris in the mid 1820s, was not a daily newspaper. Between June of 1820 (when *Le Censeur Européen*, *L'Indépendant*, and *La Renommée* were consolidated into *Le Courrier Français*<sup>16</sup>) and January of 1830 (when the first issue of *Le National* appeared<sup>17</sup>) the cast of major daily newspapers published in Paris remained fairly stable and entrenched. *Le Constitutionnel* and *Le Journal des Débats* enjoyed an exceptional and unassailable preeminence, while *Le Courrier Français*, *La Quotidienne* and a few others represented a significant and firmly established second tier. Paris in the 1820s witnessed far more dramatic journalistic developments in the realm of smaller, more specialized periodicals, of which roughly 120 were in active publication in 1827.<sup>18</sup> *Le Producteur* fell into this latter category, and was printed initially on a weekly and later on a monthly basis until its final issue appeared in December of 1826. During its brief run, *Le Producteur* enjoyed a particular kinship with several other “*journaux philosophiques*” that also emerged between 1824 and 1826. These included *Le Mémorial Catholique*, founded by Félicité-Robert de Lamennais, *Le Catholique*, founded by Ferdinand, Baron d’Eckstein, and *Le Globe*, founded by Pierre Leroux and Paul-François Dubois. Of these, *Le Globe* has been the subject of particularly extensive study by the historian Jean-Jacques Goblot. Goblot takes the discussions carried on in this group of journals as illustrative of “the tight overlap of philosophical, political, and religious questions” which he considers a conspicuous characteristic of French intellectual life during the Restoration and which he labels, somewhat uncharitably, “Confusionism.”

Goblot explains that “Confusionism” reached a high point between 1824 and 1826 largely as a result of specific political circumstances. These were the years when

the Ultra-royalist government of Prime Minister Jean-Baptiste-Francois-Joseph de Villèle was most emboldened,<sup>19</sup> first by the great success of French military intervention in Spain (which resulted in the royalists gaining a 96% majority in the Chamber of Deputies) and then by the accession of Charles X. A central aspect of Prime Minister Villèle's agenda was strengthening the relationship between the French state and the Catholic Church. The minister pursued this agenda by, among other means, passing the highly controversial Anti-Sacrilege Act of 1825, which made it a crime punishable by death to desecrate either consecrated hosts or the vessels in which they were contained.<sup>20</sup> Although it was never actually enforced, the Act had the principal effect of introducing "in legislation, as a legal truth, the mystery of the Eucharist."<sup>21</sup> Among his other aggressively reactionary measures, Villèle committed nearly a billion francs to the compensation of émigrés whose property had been confiscated during the Revolution.<sup>22</sup> Confronted by this turn of events, many of those critical of the regime for various reasons despaired of the immediate political present, adopted a longer view of history, and dreamed of the future.<sup>23</sup> Journals like *Le Mémorial Catholique*, *Le Globe*, and *Le Producteur* served as outlets for such reflection and speculation.

The contributors to these various journals shared an interest in the collaborative formulation and/or elaboration of comprehensive systems of ideas or doctrines, on the basis of which they believed future generations would enjoy social and cultural regeneration. The journals frequently called attention to each of the others' efforts, and although they often found themselves in diametric ideological opposition to one another, they nonetheless shared conspicuous points of contact. Alexandre Lachevardière, the publisher of Lamennais's *Le Mémorial Catholique*,<sup>24</sup> was also a shareholder in *Le*

*Producteur*.<sup>25</sup> Another shareholder and the publisher of *Le Producteur*, Auguste Sautelet, was a close associate of Paul-François Dubois of *Le Globe*.<sup>26</sup> One of the early contributors to *Le Producteur*, Nicolas-Louis Artaud,<sup>27</sup> was also a regular contributor to *Le Globe*.<sup>28</sup>

The contributors to *Le Producteur* came from a variety of backgrounds. One common element was that the majority of them could boast some form of higher education. Some, like Olinde Rodrigues, Prosper Enfantin<sup>†</sup> <sup>29</sup>, and Auguste Comte, had attended the *École Polytechnique*, but many more had not. Quite a few, including Leon Halévy,<sup>‡</sup> <sup>30</sup> Adolphe Garnier,<sup>§</sup> <sup>31</sup> Paul-Mathieu Laurent, Joseph Allier<sup>\*\*</sup> <sup>32</sup> and Antoine

---

<sup>†</sup> Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864) was born the illegitimate (and subsequently legitimized) son of a failed banker. Beginning in 1810, he attended the *Lycée Napoleon*, where a young Olinde Rodrigues worked as a tutor. With Rodrigues's help, Enfantin was briefly able to attend the *École Polytechnique* immediately prior to the fall of Napoleon. The shame of his father's bankruptcy, however, had a decidedly negative impact on his subsequent prospects; on this account, he was denied both an officer's commission in the Royal Bodyguards as well as his first love's hand in marriage. During the early years of the Restoration, Enfantin worked in the wine industry of Dauphine, on behalf of which he ultimately traveled throughout France and Germany as a sales representative before taking a partnership in a French bank based in Saint Petersburg. In Russia, Enfantin developed a passion for the study of political economy. Returning to France in 1824, Enfantin's newfound interest prompted him to reconnect with Rodrigues, who at that point was working as the secretary of the ailing Comte de Saint-Simon. Through Rodrigues, Enfantin was introduced to Saint-Simon and his other disciples. In 1829, Enfantin was named one of the "supreme fathers" of the Saint-Simonian Church, over which he assumed undivided authority in late 1831. In the summer of 1832, he was indicted and tried alongside his closest associates with corrupting public morality and with violating article 291 of the penal code concerning the regulation of political associations. Enfantin was convicted and sentenced to a year in prison. While serving his sentence, Enfantin largely abandoned the leadership role he had so assiduously cultivated, leaving the Saint-Simonian movement in considerable disarray. In his later career, Enfantin would be involved in various capacities in the construction of French railroads and in the colonization of Algeria.

<sup>‡</sup> Léon Halévy (1802-1883) was a distinguished student of Greek literature before becoming a disciple of Saint-Simon and joining *Le Producteur*. Afterwards, he worked first as under-librarian at the Institute of France, then as an adjunct professor of French literature at the *École Polytechnique*, then as part of the Ministry of Public Instruction as head of the bureau of historic monuments. As a very prolific writer, he began publishing poetry and translations of classical literature as early as 1821. He went on to make notable contributions to the study of Jewish history and the history of French literature. He was probably best known, however, as a writer of popular plays and vaudevilles.

<sup>§</sup> Louis-Adolphe Garnier (1801-1864) was a lawyer, philosopher, and journalist who contributed not only to *Le Producteur* but also to *Le Globe*, *La Revue Encyclopédique*, *La Revue Nouvelle*, and *La Revue des Deux Mondes*. In 1827, the Society of Christian Morality organized an essay contest to which Garnier submitted a pamphlet, "On the Death Penalty," the success of which prompted him to pursue an academic

Cerclet<sup>†† 33</sup> (the journal's first editor-in-chief), had studied law. Philippe Buchez<sup>‡‡ 34</sup> had studied medicine. Adolphe Blanqui was a particularly dedicated student of economics, and the principal disciple of Jean-Baptiste Say.<sup>35</sup> The contributors were also conspicuously young; at the age of 34, Saint-Amand Bazard<sup>§§ 36</sup> was the oldest. While

---

career. After teaching philosophy at various colleges and universities for some three decades, Garnier was made a member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Joseph Allier, as Jean-Jacques Goblot wrote in 1993, “is a poorly known person.” A biographical dictionary published in 1827 records that he was a lawyer and a political writer, and that he was born in Avignon, the 20th of June, 1794. He was one of the editors of the *Doctrinaire* in 1818 and in the early 1820s published a number of political pamphlets while also contributing to *La Revue Encyclopédique*. In 1825 he collaborated with Antoine Cerclet in writing the *Manual of the Émigré, or Selection of the Laws, Decrees, Ordinances, Senatus Consults, Orders, etc. Rendered since 1791 up until 1825*, which went through numerous editions and was reprinted as recently as February 2010 (Nabu Press). In 1826, Allier apparently also wrote a translation of Giambattista Vico's *Scienza Nuova* which competed with the one produced at the same time by the young Jules Michelet. After extensive negotiations, Allier's translation was never published. There does not seem to be any mention of Allier after 1827.

<sup>††</sup> Antoine Cerclet (1796-1849) was a publicist and a lawyer. Initially educated at Geneva, he studied law and passed the bar in Paris before becoming a disciple of Saint-Simon and joining *Le Producteur*. He went on to serve as editor on both *Le National* and *Le Journal des Débats*.

<sup>‡‡</sup> Philippe-Joseph-Benjamin Buchez (1796-1865) was a politically-engaged historian and philosopher as well as a medical doctor. Prior to their joint involvement in the Saint-Simonian school, Buchez was a close associate of Saint-Amand Bazard, with whom he had collaborated in founding *La Charbonnerie*, an elaborate clandestine republican organization conceived in direct imitation of the Italian *Carbonari*. Buchez was among the foremost members of the Saint-Simonian movement until 1829, when it became clear that Bazard and Enfantin were attempting to establish themselves as the heads of a new religion. This development presented an irreconcilable conflict with Buchez's Catholicism, to which he remained profoundly dedicated throughout his life. After leaving the Saint-Simonian movement, Buchez went on to publish the *Journal des Sciences Morales et Politiques* as well as numerous influential independent works which ultimately established him as arguably the principal initiator of the Social Catholic movement.

<sup>§§</sup> Saint-Amand Bazard (1791-1832) was one of the few autodidacts among the contributors to *Le Producteur*. His birth was the product of an adulterous affair, and resulted in the separation of his parents. He was left to support himself at the age of 16. He served in the National Guard and greatly distinguished himself in the resistance to the occupation of Paris in 1814. He earned a modest living as an employee of the internal customs administration, and for some time worked as an editor for the liberal journal, *l'Aristarque*. In 1819 he began his association with Philippe Buchez, with whom he would help found *La Charbonnerie* in 1821. Although the insurrection envisioned by *La Charbonnerie* ultimately came to naught, it was through this organization that Bazard became publicly known as the friend and protégé of his co-conspirator, the Marquis de Lafayette. Between 1828 and 1830, Bazard was the principal deliverer of the series of public lectures titled, *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition*. Beginning in 1829, Bazard served with Enfantin as one of the two “Supreme Fathers” of the Saint-Simonian religion. In 1831, however, he encountered a vitriolic disagreement with Enfantin, as a result of which Bazard suffered a stroke. He withdrew from the movement, and died not long after.

some, like Allier and Ambroise Senty,<sup>\*\*\* 37</sup> would fade into obscurity within a few years thereafter, for many, like Blanqui, Garnier, Buchez, and Armand Carrel,<sup>††† 38</sup> their work on *Le Producteur* stood at the beginning of distinguished journalistic and academic careers. At the age of 23, Halévy was well on his way, having already published several works of poetry and translations of Greek literature. Prior to Saint-Simon's death, it was Halévy who had been entrusted with redacting the journal's prospectus.<sup>39</sup> It was in this prospectus that the contributors to *Le Producteur*, in attempting to formulate their doctrine, first allocated center stage to the figure of the "artist," his essential nature and his proper role in society.

---

\*\*\* Ambroise Senty was born in April 1803 in Aix-en-Provence. His contributions to *Le Producteur* marked his literary debut. He subsequently published and successfully staged three plays: two politically-minded farces and one period tragedy. After 1828 he devoted himself to the study of history and produced a well-received book on the Camisard rebellion against Louis XIV. He was entrusted with overseeing the publication of Saint-Simon's complete memoirs. Senty appears to have faded into obscurity and neither the circumstances nor the date of his death are conspicuously recorded. In the yearbooks of the Society of Dramatic Authors and Composers, Senty is listed as a living member of the society in 1872 and never mentioned afterward.

††† Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas-Armand Carrel (1800-1836) was born in Rouen, the son of a cloth merchant. In 1818, Carrel entered the military academy at Saint-Cyr from which he was very nearly expelled for being too obtrusive and loquacious in his support for the left wing of the Chamber of Deputies. Carrel graduated from the academy in 1820 and enlisted in the army as an under-lieutenant. He resigned his commission three years later, however, in order to travel to Spain and fight on behalf of the Constitutionalists in revolt at that time against King Ferdinand VII. He was captured by French forces intervening on behalf of the Spanish monarchy and narrowly escaped the death penalty for having borne arms against France. Following his release, Carrel found himself at loose ends. He was eventually able to find employment as the secretary of the historian Augustin Thierry, and it was this experience that inspired Carrel to become a writer. Thierry had worked at one point as the secretary of the Count of Saint-Simon, and it was this connection, as well as his own curiosity, that led Carrel to collaborate on *Le Producteur*. Carrel left *Le Producteur* in January of 1826 in order to contribute to *Le Constitutionnel* as well as compose and publish several noted works of history, including a *History of Modern Greece* and a *History of the Counterrevolution in England*. In 1829, along with Adolphe Thiers and Francois-Auguste Mignet, Carrel founded the aggressively liberal newspaper, *Le National*. In July of 1830, *Le National* led the public outcry against the infamous Ordinances of Saint-Cloud, and in doing so prompted the Three Glorious Days and the establishment of the July Monarchy. In the wake of the July Revolution, Thiers and Mignet accepted positions in the government and Carrel assumed full responsibility for the direction of *Le National*, which gradually adopted a more radical republican and ultimately socialist orientation over the next several years. Carrel died in 1836 after being wounded in a duel with his journalistic rival, Émile de Girardin.

## ***Le Producteur* and the Role of the Artist**

The subtitle of *Le Producteur* was perhaps misleading in listing industry first and the fine arts last among the three forms of productive human activity. The journal would go on to suffer frequent attacks on account of what its critics perceived as its crude materialism.<sup>40</sup> To a significant extent, these attacks were misguided. Although a great many of the articles published in *Le Producteur* concerned the construction of railroads and canals, the organization of agriculture, banking, taxation, international trade and the like, and although the contributors were profoundly influenced by the methods and concerns of contemporary political economists, the prospectus, and thus, *Le Producteur* as a whole, began with the following complaint:

Up until today economists have principally occupied themselves with material production, they have not considered the works of savants and of artists except in an industrial relationship, that of the salary that has been attributed to them, and of the exchangeable value of the immaterial products. They have not at all perceived the importance of moral or intellectual production.<sup>41</sup>

Among *Le Producteur*'s foremost areas of concern was the role of the artist in society. Because they understood the fundamental activity of society (distinguished from that of its various *oisif* parasites) as in some sense productive, the contributors to *Le Producteur* considered the practice of the fine arts to have ramifications that placed it well within the economist's proper field of study. This was a far cry, however, from reducing the value of the fine arts to monetary terms. If anything, the contributors sought to augment rather than diminish the significance of the fine arts. In fact, by allocating a crucially important role in the proper function of productive society to the figure of the artist, *Le Producteur* can be read as articulating a powerful appeal to contemporary artists and to men of letters in particular.

Of all the fine arts, the contributors to *Le Producteur* were most interested in the practice of literature. “It is, in effect,” the Prospectus states,

literature which determines the direct action of the sciences and the fine arts upon the multitude: it is she who puts in contact with the masses the savant and his discoveries, the philosopher and his conceptions, the artist and the products of his talent. It is the living expression of the forms, of the needs of the society, it is the continuous application of thought to all those who can contribute to its interests and its pleasures.<sup>42</sup>

Literature, according to the Prospectus, is essentially a sort of super-art that effectively serves to coordinate all the various forms of productive activity. In order to fulfill this function, a writer must above all give voice to the moral principles of his age. The worst sort of literature is that which relies on pure “imagination,” that is, flights of fancy bearing no relation to and seeking to have no significant impact upon the society in which the author lives. In the prospectus, this genre of literature constitutes “a direction in which they [litterateurs] have no more to exploit, that of the imagination without object, of the retrograde imagination.” The exact relation good writing ought to bear to the ideas and morality of contemporary society is not always so clear, however.

One of the more conspicuous ambiguities pervading the prospectus and *Le Producteur* as a whole pertains to the question of whether a writer, interested principally in earning a living, should simply attempt to accurately reflect a concrete moment already pervading the public consciousness, or if he should attempt to take a leading role in forming that consciousness. Should artists be passive reporters or active movers of public thought and belief? At one point the authors seem to take the former position, suggesting,

if they [litterateurs and artists in general] second the general movement of the human spirit, if they wish to serve the common cause as well, to contribute to the development of the general well-being, to produce in man



fruitful sensations, such that it pertains to his developed intelligence to experience, and to propagate, in aid of these sensations, the generous ideas that are current, then just as soon they will see opened before them an immense future of glory and of success; they can re-conquer all of their energy, and elevate themselves to the highest point of dignity that they are capable of attaining.<sup>43</sup>

In this passage the litterateurs are reduced to merely “seconding” the “general movement of the human spirit,” propagating ideas that already exist and are “current.” Here the authors of the Prospectus seem to be appealing to those litterateurs more concerned with attaining worldly “glory and success” than with proactively exercising their creative intellectual capacities. At another point, however, the Prospectus states unequivocally:

This will be our task: we attempt to indicate to the savants, to the industrials and to the artists, how they should combine their beliefs and their sentiments in the interest of the common utility, of their particular glory and of their own dignity. We will not cease to repeat first of all that it is up to them to destroy entirely the empire that the vague and mystical beliefs can still exercise; secondly, by solid demonstrations, the conceptions of the arts and the combinations of industry; to assure in sum, by the great results of their work, and by their powerful action, the triumph of intelligence, of genius and of the moral force, over animal force and over numerical superiority.<sup>44</sup>

Here the artists seem to be entrusted with a great deal more primacy and initiative. It is their own beliefs and sentiments which will serve to destroy the empire of the vague and mystical beliefs, and it is up to them to ensure that these beliefs are not drowned out by the crude force of numbers. Thus this passage constitutes an appeal to those writers who see their profession in more idealistic and self-important terms. Interestingly enough, both of these seemingly opposite approaches to the literary profession are described as serving to enhance the writer’s “dignity”, a term recurring quite conspicuously in the Prospectus and in *Le Producteur* in general.

Several articles published subsequently in *Le Producteur* expound further upon the artist/writer's role as alternatively leader and/or follower of public sentiment. The belief in the capacity and obligation among artists/writers to exert a positive, formative influence on their audience is articulated perhaps most elaborately and eloquently by the young Prosper Enfantin in his essay, "Time – Public Opinion." Enfantin attacks what he considers the "metaphysical" concept of "Time" in order to repudiate a craven sort of gradualism. "Time is no longer for us an old man with a long beard," he writes, "...but to listen to quite a few people, this old man still exists. He walks, he acts, he destroys, he creates; it is he who changes the mores of peoples, who corrects their laws; let time take care of it, they say, it will bring the perfections you desire, if these changes ought to occur."<sup>45</sup> Enfantin means to attack the belief that history somehow possesses its own motive force in which one can and should trust complacently. What the word "Time" actually refers to when it is used in this way, argues Enfantin, is the collective influence of leading industrials, savants and artists, who together are capable of exercising such a powerful constructive and moral force on humanity that the resulting direction appears inexorable. He concludes from this that it would be absurd "to defer to time in order to obtain useful changes to society, and not to demand them directly from the men who, hidden behind the name of time, are the only ones capable of bringing them about." Parsing the various achievements frequently attributed to the simple passage of time, Enfantin attributes some to the influence of the industrials, some to that of the savants, and finally some to that of the artists, insisting that "to pretend that time has gentled our mores is to say that the influence exercised by litterateurs, by artists, by all men who have the mission of perfecting the sentiments, has yielded a great effect in social relations."<sup>46</sup>

To look to the future and hope for improvements to the basic fabric of society is therefore to demand considerable leadership from artists and perhaps especially from writers.

Having discredited one manifestation of the “metaphysical vice,” Enfantin turns his attention to the concept of “Public Opinion,” to which he argues is often imparted a similarly exaggerated degree of autonomy. “Public opinion is the queen of the world, they tell us, it censures kings, it makes justice of crime, it recompenses virtue, etc.; but what is public opinion?”<sup>47</sup> Enfantin demands to know, and why, if one imagines it to be the opinion of the greatest number of people, does it so often conspire against their best interests? Why did public opinion seem to support the despotism of Napoleon, for instance? Enfantin suggests that public opinion has proven itself all too susceptible to the influence of what remained of the feudal aristocracy, i.e. the “*oisifs*.” In order to counteract this pernicious influence, according to Enfantin, it is necessary that artists regain “their confidence in the moral influence that they can exercise upon the masses, if they know to move them by the painting of their future.” In the face of the “confused mixture of ideas” pervading contemporary French society, to which he attributes the impossibility of any true “public spirit” or legitimate “public opinion,” Enfantin holds out hope “that an opinion will come to light, as opinions can come to light, and that it will rally around it the majority of the individual doctrines.” Careful not to attribute any agency to the discredited metaphysical understanding of time, Enfantin suggests that rather “one should expect [the savants and the artists] to be the ones to create and propagate the common doctrine, which would be called, following them, to one day reign over hearts and minds [*esprits*].”<sup>48</sup> Thus Enfantin attributes a significant degree of originality and initiative to the role of the artist.

As in the prospectus, however, many of the contributors to *Le Producteur* also place emphasis on the need of writers/artists to be receptive and in tune with the thoughts and feelings of their audience. Ambroise Senty, for example, in a review of recently published poetry, reflects on the dramatic decline in French nationalist sentiment since the end of Napoleon's tenure, and insists that, "it is necessary for [poets] that they follow this movement if they don't want to get left behind. When one wants to make poetry of circumstance, it is necessary to be inspired by the ideas of the moment."<sup>49</sup> Joseph Allier, in his review of a retrospective exhibition of the works of Jacques-Louis David, considers it most remarkable that the artist's paintings, when organized chronologically, constitute a stirring visual history of the entire Revolution from the swearing of the Tennis Court Oath to the decline of the Empire. That David's career managed to flourish over this long and tumultuous era is testimony to his political sensitivity and adaptability, which Allier considers the hallmark of a great artist. "Nothing is capable of varying like a great artist," he writes, "because nothing is as susceptible as he is to vividly receiving new impressions."<sup>50</sup> Also in this vein, Adolphe Garnier concludes in his philosophical dialogue, "On Dramatic Art," that "It is necessary to appropriate the theater to our epoch.... In order to make good dramas today, it is necessary not only to know the conditions of a good dramatic composition, but to have profoundly studied the current tendency of our society, and to reproduce it on the stage."<sup>51</sup>

For their part, Antoine Cercllet and Philippe Buchez emphasize the need for writers/artists to be both leaders and followers in according them an intermediary role between scientists and the broader population. In his "Several Reflections on Literature and the Fine Arts," Buchez summarizes succinctly that

It is not exactly the point to say that litterateurs and artists should limit themselves exclusively to accurately expressing the sentiments of their epoch: that is a subaltern role that is appropriate only to feeble souls without energy... To sense the evil of his epoch and to express it, to conceive the future, to discover by inspiration that which the sciences apprehend [through reason], and to show to the great number this path of wellbeing and of immortality, this is what appertains to the great talents.<sup>52</sup>

Cerclet elaborates at much greater length on the nature and rationale of this relationship between the arts and the sciences in his “Philosophical Considerations on Literature.” According to Cerclet, “All social organization, in its whole and in its parts, goes back... as to a first principle, to a conception of the nature of humanity.”<sup>53</sup> To develop a conscious, rational understanding of human nature, however, requires a lifetime of rigorous study. A rational understanding of the principles underlying social cohesion can thus only ever be the privilege of a very narrow sector of the populace, i.e. the savants/scientists. The vast majority of humanity simply has neither the time nor the education to participate in rational, scientific discourse. And yet, every member of a society must, on some level, assent and adhere to certain basic truths if that society is to function. The specific function of artists thus lies in being able to grasp and communicate the discoveries and insights of the savants in intuitive, sentimental terms that everyone can follow. “Just as the processes of the sciences are slow, painstaking, and do not succeed except with time,” writes Cerclet, “the action of the fine arts, by the attraction that they offer to the spirit, to the senses and to the imagination, is at once easy, immediate, and rapid.”<sup>54</sup> In this way, by engaging in **sentimental persuasion**, rather than **rational demonstration**, artists establish the essential bond holding society together. While it may seem as though such a schematic understanding denies artists a

significant measure of primacy and initiative, as Buchez suggests, the particular genius of artists bears with it a particular dignity.

It is also perhaps worth noting the extent to which, for Cerclet and Buchez, the dignity of the artist's proper role in society is subtly conjoined to a sense of its masculinity. Remarking upon the abysmal state of contemporary literature, Cerclet asserts that,

if... a small number of more fortunate writers have achieved some relation between their sentiments and those of the public, the cause is not at all in the vigor and the originality of their conceptions; it is not that acting upon their audience, they have penetrated it with their thoughts and passions, it is, to the contrary, that having or adopting the reader's, they are faithful interpreters of them, harmonious echoes of them. Products of the public, they don't bring anything to it. It is by following it, like courtesans or friends, and not guiding it, like masters or models, that they have obtained some measure of assent.<sup>55</sup>

The relationship between a writer and his audience as described in this passage is palpably sexual. According to Cerclet, whereas the honorable writer plays a decidedly masculine role, the behavior of the vast majority of writers has of late been shamefully feminine. Buchez also makes use of gendered language in his description of the proper function of the fine arts. He writes, "The genius of the fine arts is not at all a vulgar genius, this is not at all a slave destined to follow society step by step; it appertains to him to march out in front of her, in order to serve her as a guide; it is for him to walk, and it is for her to follow."<sup>56</sup> While it is important to recognize that Buchez has no choice, grammatically, but to use the feminine pronoun in place of "society," he might just as well have used (as he does in several other instances) any of the masculine words, "public" "time" or "century," to describe the same relationship. Without reaching too far,

it is fair to say that both Cerclet and Buechez incorporate gendered language as part of their broader exhortation to contemporary artists and writers.

Both Buechez's attempt to reconcile the artist's responsibilities as both mirror and shaper of popular sentiment as well as Enfantin's appreciation of the importance of artists in formulating and directing legitimate public opinion are foreshadowed in the prospectus with regard to one form of "art" in particular. Immediately after defining literature as the living expression of the forms and needs of society, the Prospectus goes on to explain that

The last part of this definition is particularly applicable to that part of literature that embraces and represents it in its entirety: **journalism**. This new means of communication, created by modern societies, has never been more necessary than today, and never have those who take part in this powerful activity had a more beautiful and important mission to fulfill.<sup>57</sup>

In describing the contemporary practice of journalism, the Prospectus sketches and advocates a convenient and intriguing middle path as an alternative to both completely independent intellectual initiative and complete commercialist subservience. The contributors condemn

the journals that each minister dedicates to the defense of his principles and of his works. Seeing as they never express but bastard opinions, they are long forgotten; they leave not a single memory, not even that of their name; and the same thing awaits the political pages of our days which have flown the same banner.<sup>58</sup>

Political officials cannot hope, via their own printed organs, to direct public opinion from the top down in any way they see fit. Such would be a fruitless, dishonorable exercise, as would be the work of those officials' colluding ink-swilling cronies, who are abandoning the dignity of their proper role. The Prospectus contrasts these semi-official journals with the likes of *La Minerve* and *Le Conservateur*, long-standing independent publications on opposite sides of the ideological spectrum "which not only blame the government, but

which aspire to govern.” While this might seem a more noble endeavor, the prospectus remarks that “these two pages have for some time ceased to appear, not so much because the authorities were able to put an obstacle to their publication, but because the opinions that the two represented have either been modified bit by bit or have completely disappeared.” The success or failure of a journal thus depends upon a factor independent of the rhetorical skills of the writers involved; the views expressed must find authentic resonance in the minds of their readers. The disappearance of *La Minerve* and *Le Conservateur* was thus preordained by the progressive disappearance among the reading public of both radical republicanism on the one hand and reactionary legitimism on the other. According to the Prospectus, the public clearly recognized, on some level, that the *ancien regime*’s time had passed and that any notion of returning to it “in all of its integrity does not exist anymore except in a few heads struck by vertigo and by madness.”<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, the public perceived that liberal republicanism was a purely negative doctrine, one that served only to bring about the end of the old order and to facilitate “the transition to the establishment of a new social system,” a social system that now existed in tantalizing potentiality, but not yet in actuality. According to the Prospectus,

As long as this new system will not be presented at all [in the periodical press], public opinion will remain, so to speak, in expectation and in a sort of apparent abdication. *Le Conservateur* and *La Minerve* died with the opinions that they represented: it belongs, perhaps, to a new journal to reunite all the elements of the public spirit and to reconstitute them according to the moral needs of our epoch.<sup>60</sup>

While the various elements of the nascent social system already existed piecemeal in the minds of the reading public, it was up to journalists to assemble these elements and articulate them in a coherent way, such that the next phase of human history could be



consciously and collectively recognized and thereby brought about. Until then, “public opinion” could exercise neither a practical nor a moral preeminence.

Thus, from the very outset, *Le Producteur* responded to the hunger among contemporary artists and above all among contemporary writers for honor and dignity by providing them with a vital social function. In order to be both successful and useful members of society, writers must give voice to positions not purely of their own conception. At the same time, their role, being that of synthesizers and articulators, retained a significant degree of creative importance. Without inspired writers to lead the way, history could not advance and the socio-political order would remain confused and illegitimate.

### **Art as a Facet of Public Discourse**

By explicitly broadening the term “artist” to include journalists, the Prospectus provides a key, as it were, with which to read the subsequent discussions of the fine arts published in *Le Producteur*. For the nascent Saint-Simonian school, the fine arts were of interest not so much in and of themselves but rather as an element and subject of public discourse. This perspective is apparent in the specific works of art the contributors choose to discuss as well as in the aesthetic criteria they employ in evaluating them. It is also apparent in how rarely discussions of the fine arts go unaccompanied by either explicit or thinly veiled social and political commentary.

Allier begins his article on the David exhibition with an explanation of his interest in the event which to a significant extent illustrates the general character of the concern for the fine arts demonstrated by the contributors to *Le Producteur*. Allier first makes the claim that “the ensemble of the works of a great artist is always the history of the ideas or

the facts of his times.... From this point of view," he continues, "the classification of the monuments that compose a museum is of a real importance for the education of the public." Allier ridicules the notion that works of art should be organized according to genre, since even the least educated museum goer is hardly likely to confuse a landscape for a portrait. Works of art should rather be organized chronologically, so that the viewer can thereby perceive the historical progression of ideas. It was "in this regard," Allier explains, that "the short exposition that preceded the sale of the works of David, and of which this great artist had remained proprietor just until his death, offered a real interest."<sup>61</sup> Like Allier, the other contributors to *Le Producteur* demonstrate a concern most of all for a work of art's relationship to and effect on its audience and least of all for matters of technique and formal composition.

As for the latter, the contributors emphasize above all the need for style and form to be flexible and change over time. Garnier makes the point in "On Dramatic Art" that the old delineations of theatrical genres which might have been descriptive and convenient at one point in history ought no longer to be strictly maintained. He quotes Stendhal as defining a tragedy as, "A serious and noble play, in five acts and in verse, which takes place within a single 24-hour period and in a single location." Addressing Stendhal, Garnier remarks, "Your definition, salutary for the time in which it was composed, is now oppressive. While you seek to defend it in the journals that are devoted to you, other journals don't deal with it except to beat it to ruins."<sup>62</sup> Senty concurs in his own review of a recent theatrical production that, "It is not in fixed rules, nor in arbitrary theories, but in the nature of his subject, and above all in the object that he proposes in treating it," which determines the merit of an artist's work.<sup>63</sup> Garnier and

Senty agree that all art essentially serves a social purpose and a moral end. Since the perceived interests of society are not always the same, one should expect aesthetic criteria to vary from era to era.

The aesthetic doctrines articulated in *Le Producteur* intersect with the contemporary rivalry between classicism and romanticism first and foremost insofar as the contributors are uniformly opposed to the persistent deference to classical forms and imagery. In his review of recent poetry, Senty warns that unless artists “cease to avail themselves of this overworked plot of traditional imitation to which they have been attached for centuries,” they will be forced to “satisfy themselves with distracting certain idle imaginations.”<sup>64</sup> While lavishing praise on David’s famous portrait of Napoleon crossing the Alps, Allier asserts, “This painting, in addition, presents the most formal and incontestable refutation to those incorrigible artists who don’t know how to ennoble a figure except by saddling him with a toga and sandals.”<sup>65</sup> While one might expect a member of the nascent Saint-Simonian school to be friendlier to the theme of “Mars disarmed by Venus,” Allier ultimately cites this far more obscure painting as evidence of David’s subsequent decline.<sup>66</sup>

Above all, the contributors assess the merit of a work of art based on the appropriateness of its content to the moment in history occupied by its audience. This can mean, as Allier demonstrates, that a work of art that may once have been praiseworthy and suitable according to the sentiments and conditions of the time at which it was created may later prove highly objectionable. He cites the example of David’s “Death of Marat,” in which the firebrand is lionized and his assassin implicitly condemned. “For us,” Allier contends, “men of the 19th century, we want to see

Charlotte Corday calm before her victim. For us, she was a heroine, and not an impulsive woman, who avenged her lover in a time when the reign of force, imposing silence on justice, only permitted an appeal to force.”<sup>67</sup> Allier suggests, however, that such an anachronistic attitude lacks an appreciation for the complex circumstances under which both the murder and the painting were executed. Compared to David, “Mr. Pichat” has less of an excuse for the outdated theme of his play, “Leonidas.” In his generally positive review, Senty specifically condemns two lines of dialogue in which the mother of two soldiers expresses greater concern for the fate of Greece than for that of her sons. Senty insists that while such a nationalistic and militaristic message might have resonated with a French audience several decades earlier, it is no longer likely to have the same effect on an audience living in the mid-1820s.<sup>68</sup>

Garnier’s discussion of the forms and motifs appropriate to contemporary theatre is of particular interest both because of its thoroughness and because it deals in large part with how historical figures and events ought to be evaluated and depicted. The three speakers of Garnier’s dialogue concern themselves specifically with the critical evaluation of two examples of “dramatic art”: “Charles VI,” by a Mr. Delaville, and “Rienzi,” by a Mr. Jouy. Both of these plays were apparently in the midst of performances in Paris at the time Garnier wrote his dialogue, and both were enjoying a great deal of public discussion. Both plays pertained to late medieval historical figures whose experiences were strikingly topical for those living in post-Revolutionary France. In evaluating these two plays, Garnier ultimately articulates the formula that a piece of theatre is enjoyable and praiseworthy if it “reunites, by relating to our times, morality and verisimilitude.”<sup>69</sup> A play delving into historical memory, whether recent or distant, must

at once be accurate and faithful to the sequence of events as they unfolded, and convey a moral theme appropriate to the time in which it is performed. These two demands can sometimes seem at odds with each other, as “Charles VI” demonstrates. “Charles VI” tells the story of the mad French king who famously failed to defend his country against the invasion of Henry V. One would undoubtedly expect the themes of tragic defeat, of a France humbled by its neighbor across the Channel, of noble intentions thwarted by error and incompetence, to resonate with French audiences of the 1820s. Garnier worries, however, that the play may thus serve to stir up nationalist sentiment, which would be both socially irresponsible on the part of the playwright and anachronistic, since the various squabbles over the French crown in the early part of the 15th century were motivated not so much by nationalism as by dynastic ambition. In writing the play, Mr. Delaville apparently shared this concern, and so decided to give Henry V a genial, not altogether wicked disposition.<sup>70</sup> While Garnier considers this choice to have been motivated by “a certain decency” on the part of the author, he concludes that to “sweeten all the traits of Henry’s character [while also describing] the shameful means employed by the English prince in order to attain the crown, composes a not very clear character, and not even a very natural one.”<sup>71</sup> Thus “Charles VI” fails to fully meet either the standard of morality or the standard of verisimilitude.

As a series of reflections on the nature of political authority, however, Garnier’s critical evaluation of “Rienzi” is by far the more interesting. Mr. Jouy’s play recounts the story of Cola di Rienzo, a commoner who managed to seize control of the city of Rome and its surrounding territories for a brief period during the late 1340s simply by force of personality and appeal to public sentiment. As “Tribune,” Di Rienzo attempted to unify

Italy and restore the Roman Empire. Di Rienzo/“Rienzi” encountered his most strident opposition among Rome’s aristocratic families. In Jouy’s account, the aristocrats, led by Stefano Colonna, surreptitiously spread division and stir up popular discontent against Rienzi, ultimately precipitating his downfall. While one might expect a member of the nascent Saint-Simonian school to be favorably disposed to a historical example of a charismatic visionary of humble origins attempting to unite a discordant populace through sheer eloquence in the face of intransigence on the part of the “*oisif*” establishment, Garnier is profoundly ambivalent. Having employed violent and oppressive means once in power, Garnier reminds his readers, Rienzi was a tyrant. As a member of Mr. Jouy’s audience watching the rivalry unfold on stage between the tyrannical Rienzi and the perfidious Colonna, “there is not a single instant where one feels the need to see one prevail over the other.”<sup>72</sup> Faced with what he sees as a crude celebration of courage and ambition, Garnier condemns the idolization of unscrupulous “great men.”<sup>73</sup> As for the play’s verisimilitude, Garnier objects to the fact that,

The author makes the people moved according to when he has need of their movements, like a regiment which one commands at will to make a half turn to the left, and a half turn to the right; and sometimes it is on the side of Rienzi, and sometimes on the side of Colonna, without having any good reason for this change.<sup>74</sup>

In reality, Garnier suggests, the public is not nearly so easily manipulated.

Garnier’s discussion of “Rienzi” is perhaps particularly suggestive of how closely the discussions of the fine arts published in *Le Producteur* are tied, whether implicitly or explicitly, to discussions of journalism and politics. Nowhere is this relation more obvious than in Buchez’s “Several Reflections on Literature and the Fine Arts.” Among the many concerns that he articulates in this relatively lengthy article, Buchez complains

that the cultural commodities market has grown so wide and diverse that consumers no longer find themselves compelled to leave their respective comfort zones, nor are they particularly willing to try. Whether he goes to the theater or the salon, writes Buchez, the cultural consumer will see only, “that which is made specifically for him. There he admires and there he applauds himself. If there is a passing jeer or whistle, it will not be because the work is bad, but because it has wounded his opinions and his faction.”

Although Buchez does not state so explicitly, this description is surely just as applicable to the cultural consumer’s typical encounter with a newspaper. In fact, Buchez’s description of the plight of artists working under such circumstances offers a remarkable parallel to William Reddy’s description of the plight of early 19th century French journalists. So wary of offending the delicate sensibilities of this or that faction, Buchez writes, “the majority of artists live day to day, and do not attach themselves but to subjects of momentary interest.” Faced with this parallel, one is necessarily reminded of the Prospectus’s conspicuous inclusion of journalists within the category of artists.

In several instances, Buchez draws more explicit connections between cultural and political discourse. After asserting that literature and the fine arts, just like laws and governments ought to be “the expression of society,” Buchez makes the sweeping generalization that

In all current social realities we find a discordance, a lack of harmony of the same sort; above all, we do not see appear anything other than a perpetual clash of opposed opinions and of contradictory sentiments, without evident direction, without designated end, and in the midst of which artists hesitate, searching for a fixed standard of beauty and of merit that they do not find, and governments totter, pursuing a stability that they do not regain.<sup>75</sup>

According to Buchez, artists and governments suffer from essentially the same disease as a result of essentially the same pathogens. Their symptoms are roughly analogous.

Discussing the contentious opposition between classicism and romanticism, Buchez observes that “The classicist and the romanticist divide the world [of art] just as legitimism and liberalism divide the world of politics.” Comparing the two schools of art, Buchez agrees with his colleagues that classicism has long since ceased to be a fruitful source of inspiration. Much like legitimism, classicism is a doctrine for which “the ideal is in outdated conceptions.” It is not entirely commendable, however, that romanticism “asks nothing of the ancients, nothing of the religious era.” In romanticism, Buchez writes,

man considers himself in his isolation; if he investigates himself, he finds himself alone; and looking at the present and the future, he sees nothing there... doubt afflicts him and torments him. It is a continual effort and never satisfied, an ardor without object but never exhausted. All pains, all sufferings, all violences please him; he needs furors and delirium. Such is this modern school; such can one see in the great artists that she has produced: Goethe, Byron, Lamartine; so is its character found again in the works of Delacroix, of St.-Evre, etc.<sup>76</sup>

While classicism might very well be a dead end, so too is romanticism. Proceeding from an essentially anti-social impulse, romanticism, like liberalism, is a purely negative doctrine; embracing romanticism will not lead to the desired cultural consensus any more than embracing liberalism will lead to the desired political consensus; it will not suffice.

It is nevertheless difficult to assess the level of sarcasm with which Buchez refers to Byron, Goethe and Lamartine as “great artists;” their talents notwithstanding, their work may simply not serve the ends with which he and the other contributors to *Le Producteur* are concerned. Rather than “maintaining a public status for art,” as Philippe Régnier would have it, a better formulation might be that the early Saint-Simonians were



interested in art only insofar as art was a form of public communication and education. Allier, Senty, Garnier and Buchez all evaluated works of art on this basis. It is hardly surprising, then, as part of this general conception, that *Enfantin* should assign artists the responsibility for generating “public spirit” and formulating legitimate “public opinion.” The persistent intrusion, whether implicit or explicit, of political themes and parallels into the contributors’ discussions of the fine arts, tends to suggest that the latter proceeded from their broader interest in the mutual interaction between public discourse and the social, cultural, and political conditions that frame it. For the contributors to *Le Producteur*, the “elephant in the room” was what Habermas labeled the Public Sphere.

### **The Corruption of the Public Sphere**

Buchez and *Enfantin* are representative of the contributors to *Le Producteur* in identifying what may be called the corruption and degeneracy of the public sphere, that is to say, in describing a set of social and cultural conditions that impede rather than facilitate the effective formulation, communication, and implementation of ideas. This pessimistic outlook often initially manifests itself in a dim assessment of the relatively ignominious role assigned to artists in contemporary society compared with the one apparently enjoyed by their counterparts during various earlier periods in Western history. Cercllet bemoans in his “Philosophical Considerations Regarding Literature” that

No longer do Herodotus or Sophocles have Greece assembled for an audience; no longer does Italy restore the triumphs of the capitol for Petrarch; nor is Tasso, after a long and humiliating journey, called to the capitol to be crowned; no longer is Voltaire, in spite of the hatred of princes, surrounded by the Parisian people, exhausted, succumbing under the homage rendered to his genius.<sup>77</sup>

It would seem from this catalogue of representative luminaries that nearly every other period in Western history afforded greater opportunities for the manifestation, expression,

and fulfillment of literary genius than the current one. Senty concurs, asking, “has poetry ever had less influence on men? One could say as much of all the other branches of the fine arts. In conclusion, is the reign of the artists finished with no return? Will they from now on be parasites on civilization?”<sup>78</sup> Exactly how long this decadence is perceived to have persisted is not altogether clear, however. Garnier, in his philosophical dialogue “On Dramatic Art,” compares Racine to Aeschylus as artists whose work, unlike that of most current playwrights, conveys a pleasure that transcends the mere distraction or amusement one might otherwise obtain through a card game or glass of liquor.<sup>79</sup> Cerclet’s tribute to Voltaire would seem to characterize the downward trend as beginning more recently. Allier, in his review of the David exhibit, suggests that the artist’s work had lost its previously indisputable greatness only in the last two decades or so.<sup>80</sup> Thus, the dispiriting cultural decadence acknowledged by so many of *Le Producteur*’s contributors might be a very recent development indeed.<sup>††† 81</sup>

However longstanding it might be, the contributors to *Le Producteur* consider the shameful state of contemporary cultural affairs to be characterized by a disturbing and pervasive indifference and detachment on the part of both the producers and consumers of art. This indifference is illustrated in Garnier’s dialogue, “On Dramatic Art,” which takes place between three characters: “The Philosopher,” “The Man of Letters” and “The

---

<sup>†††</sup> Interestingly enough, most of the artists cited by the contributors belong to what Saint-Simon would have considered “critical” rather than “organic” periods in history. Although the Saint-Simonians would ultimately attach great importance to the dichotomy between “critical” and “organic” epochs, and would consider it an article of their dogma that truly great art could only be produced during the latter, this dichotomy was never explicitly established in *Le Producteur*. Although the term “critical” appeared often enough, it was nearly always used to describe a “spirit,” “philosophy,” or “doctrine” to which the contributors to *Le Producteur* would contrast the “positive” “philosophy” or “doctrine” they were attempting to elaborate and espouse. Saint-Amand Bazard was exceptional among the contributors in making use of the term “organic,” which he used to describe a “direction” rather than an “epoch.” Thus the Saint-Simonians’ early philosophy of history was, perhaps unsurprisingly, considerably more flexible than would later be the case.

Man of the World.” The Man of Letters acts principally as an interlocutor for the Philosopher, asking probing and helpful questions that facilitate the Philosopher’s exposition of his (and by extension, Garnier’s) various aesthetic doctrines. The Man of the World, however, represents a source of frustration. The typical theatergoer, The Man of the World repeatedly expresses a lack of interest in what the other two characters are saying. While the Philosopher and the Man of Letters argue over whether theatre ought to imitate nature, The Man of the World remarks nonchalantly,

Imitate nature or don’t imitate it, provided that you amuse me, it doesn’t matter to me. I do not see in a dramatic work anything but a means of bringing about singular and unaccustomed situations that strike and surprise the spirit; I would even be of the opinion that one should move away from reality a bit in order to generate more surprise, and consequently more pleasure.<sup>82</sup>

The Philosopher, frustrated but not antagonistic, accuses The Man of the World of “loving all enjoyments en masse” and encourages him to be more discerning.<sup>83</sup> Cerclet seems to echo Garnier’s concern that most members of the public view art and culture as merely an enjoyable diversion along the lines of horseracing or cockfighting. If forced to compete with these other forms of popular amusement, the fine arts may be reduced to nothing more than “playthings for large children.”<sup>84</sup> Essentially, Cerclet and Garnier are both worried that cultural consumers approach theatre and literature not looking to be intellectually challenged or enlightened, but rather to avoid critical reflection entirely. For his part, however, Cerclet is equally concerned with the relation of writers to their own work. According to Cerclet, the literature of the early 19th century is characterized by the “writer without conviction in what he has written, presenting a work barely achieved, of which the subject has cost him the majority of his strengths in order to find a nuance that differentiates it.”<sup>85</sup> This remark, much like the one previously cited from

Buchez to the effect that “the majority of artists live day to day, and do not attach themselves but to subjects of momentary interest,” expresses a significant degree of sympathy for the lot of a writer attempting to work under such cultural conditions, who as a result “has not drawn... any recompense for the price of his long nights spent awake and for the pitiful life to which he has condemned himself.”<sup>86</sup> Thus the contributors continue to frame their description of the pervasive obstacles to serious and sincere public discourse as an appeal to the concerns of contemporary writers.

In allocating responsibility for these lamentable phenomena, the contributors to *Le Producteur* very frequently point to the corruptive influence of commercialization. Cercllet describes the highest success to which contemporary writers may aspire as, “the applause of a few days for which it is necessary to give the signal by mercenary hands, an ephemeral vogue that does not start but after numerous and repeated appeals to the public.”<sup>87</sup> Here Cercllet refers to the notorious French institution of *clagues*, that is, groups of audience members hired for the opening performances of a new theatrical production and paid to clap wildly at prearranged moments. Much like an 18th or 19th Century laugh-track, *clagues* allowed a producer to engineer a successful opening and ensure that the wider circles of Parisian society would take notice. Contemporary critics considered the hiring of *clagues* to be a shameful if nonetheless ubiquitous practice. Subsequent generations of historians have pointed to *clagues* as classic examples of how the Enlightenment-era public sphere could be manipulated by moneyed interests.<sup>88</sup> Several other contributors refer more explicitly to the use of *clagues* and argue not only that this practice ultimately renders a writer’s work personally unfulfilling, but that it is detrimental to theatre as an art form. Garnier suggests that the lines penned purely for the

sake of being “thrown to the *claqueurs*”—i.e., lines that are bold enough to constitute an immediately recognizable cue for applause—often do not fit very naturally or appropriately within the broader action of the scene. Of such lines, Garnier writes, “one can and should rid a play like a useless and unnatural illumination.”<sup>89</sup> Senty suggests that popular audiences are very much aware of this form of manipulation and resent it.

According to Senty, the two overly grandiose and militaristic lines of dialogue to which he objected in “Leonidas” were delivered specifically as cues to a coterie of *claqueurs* who, at least during the performance Senty witnessed, “Did not neglect to applaud.” Of these lines, writes Senty, “it must be said in the interest of the art and of the poet himself, [that they] are not only of a revolting length, but they are also of an incredible falsity in the situation, and in hearing them, I saw around me, in the parterre, murmurs against the hired applauders.”<sup>90</sup> Joseph Allier makes pointed use of *clagues* as a metaphor to describe the excitement and expectation frequently orchestrated to coincide with the openings of visual art exhibitions. “This success of a moment,” writes Allier, “from the moment it is obtained, resembles the success of a piece of theatre that one makes succeed the first three days by applause either begged or bought.” Such hype is usually spun, according to Allier, on behalf of wealthy speculative investors whose influence, along with that of their agents and advisors, Allier rails against vociferously in more than one essay. “Ordinarily,” he writes,

The speculator is a man whose good faith is more than suspect, and the enthusiast is too often a fool or a scatterbrain whose ignorance equals his self-importance; the sort who is always duped first who, being interested in buying at base prices in order to resell at crazy prices, lets die of hunger, without the least scruple, the artist whose talent he does not know how to suffer to repress. These two miserable species of men tyrannize the arts on all points where the public does not intervene.<sup>91</sup>

Once again, the contributors frame their criticism in such a way as to express sympathy for the young, struggling writer or artist.

Insofar as they collude with moneyed interests in the spinning of hype, argue the contributors, journalists essentially fail to uphold their professional and social responsibilities. Referring to the wild speculation and underhanded dealings that allegedly took place following the David exhibition with regard to the sale of the master's paintings, Allier asserts that "If the accusations are founded, the daily newspapers ought to have done justice to the delinquents. Upholding ethics in [the buying and selling of art] certainly falls within their competence; but it is an obligation that they fulfill the least that they can."<sup>92</sup> Of all the contributors, however, Léon Halévy conducts the most brutal skewering of contemporary cultural commentators in the first of his three "Literary Bulletins," which he begins by relaying the same notice he has already read in several other journals to the effect that a new novel titled, "*Le Tartuffe Moderne*" would be appearing in print later that month. Nearly all the journals, according to Halévy, reiterated in conspicuously similar terms that the author of the new novel was a "man of much spirit." Some of the journals, "undoubtedly better informed," had also implied the merit of the manuscript by virtue of the fact that it had been bought by its publisher for the weighty sum of 10,000 francs. "I want to do even better," writes Halévy, "and I will provide for you a full account of the new novel before it has appeared." After singing the praises of the still unpublished novel to the heavens, Halévy suddenly turns to address his reader. "I hear you interject at this point," he writes:

'Stop! Stop!' you say to me; 'What a deluge of elegies! How eloquent an apology! How you spew praise with such ease! One can tell that all of your life you have been a journalist; it seems to me that I have just read a feuilleton out of a Parisian newspaper.... But, do you speak seriously, or

is this a joke? Have you already read the new novel?’ – No, of course not. – ‘Do you know the author?’ – Not in the least. I only wanted to give you an idea of the manner in which literary criticism is exercised today. I wanted to print eight days sooner what you will see next week in all of the papers. As for the book, it has already been agreed to make it fashionable, and they will not have read it any more than I have.<sup>93</sup>

When a manuscript represents such a significant financial investment on the part of the publisher, its literary merit is entirely ancillary; its success can be prearranged. In colluding with publishers in this way, journalists are guilty of practicing a form of “charlatanism” which must necessarily have a deleterious effect on the practice of literature itself. “In order to obtain some measure of success these days,” Halévy writes, “a writer needs, above all, *savoir faire*. Talent, by itself, presents few opportunities. As for genius, it has been a long time since anyone has spoken of it.”<sup>94</sup>

The contributors to *Le Producteur* are not solely concerned, however, with the corruptive influence of money. They also draw attention to the deleterious cultural effects of an absurd and outdated social hierarchy capped by an idle aristocracy. Enfantin’s reference to the ongoing influence exercised by the old nobility in “Time – Public Opinion” is perhaps most richly elaborated by Allier his article on the “Societies of the Friends of the Arts” recently founded first in Paris and then in Lyon, Bordeaux, Lille, Toulouse, Douai, Geneva, and Marseille. Allier begins his discussion by expressing his concern that those who patronize art exhibitions do not, in fact, go to see the artwork, but rather go to see the other patrons and to associate with them. Thus, what is ostensibly an exhibition of artwork “is ultimately an exhibition of *good company*.”<sup>95</sup> Allier then attempts to probe and challenge the ambiguous and ultimately perfidious concept of “*good company*.” What exactly is “*good company*?” “We as well,” he writes, “We have heard a lot of talk about *good company*; we have looked for it everywhere and

found it nowhere.” Allier goes on to quote at length the personal account of a young man who came to Paris at the age of 19 “to pursue his studies,” but who as soon as he heard mention of “high society” of the “great world” and of “good company” (three terms that seem to be used interchangeably) immediately dedicated himself to joining it.<sup>96</sup>

Apparently, he proved to be well suited to the task; “I turned a glass well enough,” he recalls, “I ate veal cutlets.” When called upon, he could also play games and discuss art and literature with a suitable degree of cleverness. At one point, after he’d been introduced to a certain “Baron T\*\*,” the young man thought he’d finally joined the *good company*; “I was part of it, I was among the angels.” It was then that he realized that he hadn’t, in fact, joined the *real good company*; that there was a *good company* within the *good company*; a closed circle within a closed circle. The core of the *good company* was actually the old nobility, which now simply preferred to go by a different name. Even within the ranks of the old nobility, there was an even narrower social circle of those closely related to the royal family.<sup>97</sup> “It is evident,” the young man deduces, “that in France the *good company* is composed of thirty people.” Allier concludes that “Good Company... [is] a thing which has no sense,” and declares it a cultural and moral imperative that the arts not be “reduced to augmenting the leisure of 30 or 40 idlers [“oisifs”] who hardly care about them.”<sup>98</sup>

For the contributors to *Le Producteur*, however, both the principal cause and the principal negative consequence of the deterioration of cultural and political discourse is a lack of unity and direction among artists and writers. With reference to journalists in league with speculative investors, Allier concludes that in place of fulfilling their proper responsibilities, “To support the people of one’s party and to strike without pity upon the



others is the precept of practical morality that they follow best.”<sup>99</sup> For Buchez, the most objectionable result of the subservience of artists and writers to moneyed interests is that it serves to entrench division among them. “As many opinions as there are,” he writes, “there are as many factions, and each faction has its litterateurs and its artists; that which pays the most having the greatest number.”<sup>100</sup> Enfantin attributes the lack of “public spirit” and legitimate “public opinion” in France to the fact that “the majority... does not have any common ideas which can serve as a bond between individual opinions.”<sup>101</sup> The establishment of such common ideas represents the chief social responsibility of artists and writers, a responsibility which they have evidently as of yet failed to recognize and fulfill. The Prospectus is perhaps most explicit of all in attributing the fundamental root of most contemporary social ills to the fact that

the representatives of the moral force of societies [i.e. artists and writers] are not reconciled: instead of directing the beliefs and sentiments of man towards a common end, they all follow different or opposing routes, one sees them employ in a manner useless to the wellbeing of the masses, by a failure of cooperation, or devoted to the service of power, by a failure of nobility and of honor, this powerful lever, this unique instrument that the moral force possesses in order to develop itself: Literature.<sup>102</sup>

With unity and direction, artists and writers would be able to effectively confront the nefarious influence of idle aristocrats, wealthy speculators, and moneyed political interest groups. With unity and direction, artists and writers would be able to regain their honor and their proper role in society. With unity and direction, artists and writers would be able to rehabilitate the public sphere.

### **Achieving Concord**

But how is this unity and direction to be effected? Is disagreement to be forcibly repressed? Is the censor to adopt a new and unprecedented level of importance? The

Prospectus concludes by suggesting that this should not be the case. Having already suggested that the predominance of their “positive” doctrine will be attained purely as a result of its unique concordance with current social realities, and that this concordance constituted a mechanism far superior to any official censorship for marginalizing those ideologies in too great a disagreement with their own, the contributors acknowledge that

Without doubt, it may come to us, after having admitted the same principles, to divide ourselves regarding their application and upon their means of execution; but these controversies of details cannot but turn to the profit of truth, because it is impossible that the discussion not gush illumination and not bring about useful results, when it proposes a positive objective and when we bring to it on both sides the disinterested love of the truth and that of the public good.<sup>103</sup>

Within the public sphere envisioned by the nascent Saint-Simonian school there will indeed be considerable room for disagreement. In fact, the contributors to the Prospectus imagine their projected public sphere as functioning much along the lines of the classic liberal ideal. Their sole qualification of this ideal is that they understand the need for at least some common principles to be taken for granted at the outset in order for disagreement to be both constructive and meaningful. They considered the public sphere as it actually existed in France in 1825 to be decidedly lacking in such common principles. They therefore condemned the intestine disputes of their contemporary public sphere as both destructive and meaningless.

Although the Prospectus suggests some of the measures that ought not to be taken in order to achieve unity and direction among artists, it does not elaborate on the preferable alternatives. This would be a task undertaken implicitly by several articles subsequently published in *Le Producteur*. Of the several approaches put forward, Cerclet’s is the most explicitly elitist. Condemning the “the literary quarrels of our days,

of which one makes such great noise,” Cerclet does not see why writers and artists cannot come to a consensus among themselves regarding aesthetic conventions and principles. If such relatively trivial arguments must be had at all, why should they not be held more quietly, away from the prying eyes of the consuming public? “Interior rules of art,” Cerclet asserts, “being exclusively within the jurisdiction of the artists, should not be judged by the public except according to the results; they are for the public, when it is a question of the fine arts, analogous to the methods of the savants in matters of science; [the broader public] has neither the custom, nor the time, nor the need to enquire into them.”<sup>104</sup> Those without a suitable level of expertise in a particular matter, Cerclet suggests, should be excluded from public discussion of it.

A far more populist approach, but one not necessarily in conflict with that of Cerclet, is elaborated by Allier, who enthusiastically celebrates the inclusiveness of the Societies of the Friends of the Arts. The societies, he points out, are funded by an unlimited number of annual subscriptions priced at 100 francs. Any subscriber can subscribe one year and not the next. This relatively inexpensive and highly flexible membership, Allier argues, provides the essential conditions allowing for many families of modest means to take part in patronage of the arts. The societies then use the funds at their disposal to acquire works of art and then distribute them randomly among the society’s members.<sup>105</sup> Because the society must acquire a considerable quantity of artwork in order to retain its members, the directors of the society cannot afford to speculate too wildly on any one painting or sculpture. Such a cooperative arrangement for the patronage of the arts provides for more stable employment for a greater number of artists. Allier goes on to suggest additional means by which the societies might further

facilitate the practice of the fine arts. For example, they might establish food pantries for the benefit of “the artists who suffer innumerable privations in the hopes of one day being the glory of the nation.”<sup>106</sup> While the Societies still establish a division between insiders and outsiders, their objective is to provide to as wide a sector of the population as possible the choice to fall on one side of the divide or the other. The Societies are exemplars of the sort of voluntary associations which are “at first of little importance, [and] are neither honored with the protection nor the hate of anyone, but which develop themselves little by little, change the habits to which the people attach themselves, and which the government is forced to respect.”<sup>107</sup> For Allier, such voluntary associations constitute powerful instruments for the mending of social and political divisions.

Some of the contributors adopt a simpler and more straightforward response to the turmoil of the public sphere by merely emphasizing the need for greater solidarity and professional courtesy among writers. Such is the approach adopted by Senty in his review of Pichat’s “Leonidas.” The review is perhaps most remarkable for the conspicuous awareness Senty demonstrates of his own role and responsibilities as a reviewer. While he has a number of criticisms to make, his overall evaluation of Pichat’s work is quite favorable, and Senty is extremely wary of his review being misunderstood and having an inadvertently negative impact on the commercial success of the production. “This play has obtained a great success at its first performances,” he writes,

It has had a moment that one calls [being in] vogue. Everyone who goes to see tragedies in Paris has gone to see it [at least] once, and all the newspapers, even the most rigorous, have given it the greatest praise. While we do not completely share in the opinion of the other critics regarding the work of Mr. Pichat, in the interest of the art we have wanted to wait [to publish our review] until the test of multiple performances and above all the reading of the printed play had fixed the opinion of the public regarding the dramatic and literary merit of this tragedy.<sup>108</sup>

Senty's review very arguably represents the practical application of early Saint-Simonian ideals to the conduct of public discourse. Disagreements among artists must inevitably occur, yet their criticisms must be restrained in such a way as to ensure that discourse remains civil, that undue personal offense not be taken, and above all, that the public not be needlessly confused to the point of negatively affecting the practice of the art in question. At the end of his review, Senty reiterates these concerns, writing,

I will not press the examination of the tragedy of "Leonidas" any farther. While totally in rendering justice to the competence with which the author has distributed his action, I felt obligated to critique a few vices in the characters and in the style, I hope that Mr. Pichat will not see, in the care that I have taken in examining his play, but a proof of my esteem for his talent: and I am pleased to remind [my readers] that the tragedy of "Leonidas," such as it is, is still very beautiful. In addition, I waited until today to publish these observations, in order not to trouble the first joys of his triumph; and I publish them today persuaded that they would not be detrimental to the brilliant success that his play has obtained.<sup>109</sup>

At every step, Senty's criticism is carefully measured out of consideration for its potential influence on the reading public and for maintaining cordial relations between himself and Mr. Pichat, even at the cost of reducing the topicality of his review and thus potentially reducing his own readership.

## **Conclusion**

In describing the specific contemporary appeal of Saint-Simonianism as well as the strategy of its propagators, Robert Carlisle calls significant attention to the statement made by Enfantin in February of 1826 to the effect that "It is necessary that the *École Polytechnique* be the canal by which [our] ideas spread in society."<sup>110</sup> As noteworthy as it might be, Carlisle neglects to clarify that this statement was made in a letter not to a fellow contributor to *Le Producteur*, but to one of Enfantin's friends and fellow

*polytechniciens* whom he made a special and ultimately unsuccessful effort to indoctrinate. In February of 1826, Enfantin was only one of many members of the nascent Saint-Simonian school, the majority of whom had no connection to the *École Polytechnique* and who likely assessed the appeal of their emerging ideology and its potential avenues for advancement in a variety of ways. Even Enfantin, in his article, “Time – Public Opinion” reserved a crucially important role for the figure of the “artist” in the projected advancement of the new doctrine and the future of humanity. No broad-based cultural or political consensus could be expected to take shape as the result of an appeal to reason alone. Above all the achievement of such a consensus necessitated an appeal to popular sentiment, an appeal which only “artists,” a term understood to encompass all those possessing a mastery of the communicative and sentimental faculties, were capable of making.

By broadening the conventional application of the term “artist” to include journalists and men of letters more generally, the contributors to *Le Producteur* engaged in a particular variant of the “confusionism” described by Jean-Jacques Goblot as typical of Restoration-era intellectual discourse. This form of confusionism was characterized by the consistent understanding of culture, society, and politics as fundamentally inseparable from one another such that a criticism of one could not but suggest and involve criticism of the other two. While this inseparability was evidenced most explicitly by Buchez in his “Several Reflections,” it is readily apparent throughout many articles published earlier in *Le Producteur*, beginning with the Prospectus. From start to finish, it is obvious in Cerclet’s “Philosophical Considerations;” it provides the entire basis for Allier’s discussion of the “Societies of the Friends of the Arts;” it undergirds

both Senty's and Garnier's criticism of contemporary theatre. The conceptual connection between culture, society and politics is so strong that it is often difficult for the reader to discern which of the three is actually being discussed. Their fundamental objects of interest, it seems, were the conditions shaping public discourse in general, i.e. the contemporary structure of the public sphere.

The contributors to *Le Producteur* viewed this structure as corrupt and dysfunctional for a variety of reasons, the most central of which being its lack of a basic ideological foundation, at least a certain number of ideas held in common by all the participants that would enable their disagreements to be both substantive and productive as well as allow them to better combat the corruptive influence of moneyed interests and the idle aristocracy. Nevertheless, the contributors understood that some disagreements would and should always occur, and scrupulously avoided the suggestion that any central figure of authority ought to impose assent by force. They rather imagined a situation in which a heightened sense of cooperation and solidarity among "artists" would permit the progressive development and communication of ideas without generating needless confusion and disorder among the broader population. Such a situation would, moreover, promote the honor, dignity and self-fulfillment of the artists themselves.

This vision of the public sphere, although clearly divergent, was not in complete opposition to that of classical liberalism. The early Saint-Simonians maintained that public opinion could and ought to exercise a practical and moral authority in politics and in society. The problem, as Enfantin diagnosed it most explicitly, was that contemporary cultural conditions did not permit public opinion to exercise such an authority. Furthermore, the early Saint-Simonians refused to make of public opinion too abstract

and autonomous an entity, drawing attention to the ways in which public opinion could be actively shaped and directed, for better or for worse, by a relatively narrow sector of society. In this respect, at least, the early Saint-Simonians arguably demonstrated not a utopian idealism so much as a frank realism.

### **Epilogue: The Folding of *Le Producteur***

In the spring of 1826, *Le Producteur* experienced a crisis that would to some degree seal its fate. In March, the contributors were scandalized and the operation of the journal severely disrupted by the revelation that Cerclet had had an affair with Auguste Comte's wife, a revelation which, at least in part, prompted the first of Comte's nervous breakdowns.<sup>111</sup> Cerclet withdrew from *Le Producteur* on April 1<sup>st</sup>. None of the contributors stepped forward to fill the vacated office of editor-in-chief. The chaos that followed made it impossible for *Le Producteur* to maintain publication on a weekly basis. As of May 1<sup>st</sup>, *Le Producteur* became a monthly. The journal's staff of editors and contributors rapidly dwindled to a mere half dozen: Saint-Amand Bazard, Philippe Buchez, Prosper Enfantin, Paul-Mathieu Laurent, Olinde Rodrigues, and P. J. Rouen.<sup>112</sup> These six exceptionally dedicated men would form the core of the Saint-Simonian movement as it developed over the next several years. During the second half of 1826, however, the various demands associated with the publication of *Le Producteur* verged on overwhelming for such a small group.

It was in this diminished capacity that *Le Producteur* encountered its most formidable opposition on the part of *Le Globe*. *Le Globe* had attained considerable prestige as the organ of a pure and philosophically sophisticated liberalism, and Enfantin at least seems to have considered it almost as a snub that *Le Producteur* had not received



more significant attention from the journal prior to the autumn of 1826. On September 9<sup>th</sup>, however, *Le Globe* published an assault of formidable length and eloquence. *Le Globe* associated the school of *Le Producteur* with Reynaud de Montlosier among others who, as the anonymous author of the article put it, exhibited “the hatred of individualism and the mania of reorganization,” which, however its modern proponents might frame it, remained the same principle of despotism as the one exercised in ancient Egypt. For *Le Globe*, by contrast, the sanctity of the individual was absolutely paramount. “These words,” the author continues, “people, nation, society, are nothing but pure abstractions, a sort of abbreviation which the legislator brings into being and to which he too often sacrifices that which alone is living, that which is sensible to pleasure and to pain, that which is capable of judgment and of morality: the man, the individual.”<sup>113</sup> If the contributors to *Le Producteur* were truly concerned (as the name of their journal would suggest) with the maximization of production, they would understand the importance of allowing each individual to pursue his own self-fulfillment independently of constraint and direction, for “Political economy teaches how the all-powerful principle of the division of labor classifies and disciplines little by little this crowd of workers, without effort, without laws, by instinct; add competition and you will soon have all the marvels of civilization.”<sup>114</sup>

Enfantin’s response to *Le Globe* was quite clever. While being thoroughly respectful of “the able litterateurs”<sup>115</sup> at *Le Globe* and without accusing them of being overly hasty in their criticisms, he enumerates the important distinctions between the positions of *Le Producteur* and those of de Montlosier. He then goes on to suggest that if *Le Producteur* can be understood as advocating the doctrines of ancient Egypt, then *Le*

*Globe* can be understood as advocating the doctrines of “the savages of New Holland,”<sup>116</sup> who are, after all, completely free to pursue their own self-fulfillment independently of any direction or constraint. Enfantin also points out that even as *Le Globe* accused its various opponents of subordinating the living, breathing individual to abstract concepts, the liberal journal nevertheless relied upon its own set of abstractions: “self-fulfillment” is, after all, a fairly abstract concept, as is, “the all-powerful principle of the division of labor.” “Principles act little by themselves,” writes Enfantin, “behind them are men.”<sup>117</sup> *Le Producteur*, he explains, would hardly suggest that the principle of the division of labor should be abandoned, merely that its implementation should be in more qualified hands. Only if and when such a change is effected will society be able to avoid the evils of competition while continue to reap its benefits. Unless the evils brought about by competition are confronted, Enfantin concludes, “we will soon see all the marvels of civilization disappear.”<sup>118</sup>

Enfantin’s response, however, ultimately proved insufficient. The hostility of *Le Globe* had a profoundly dispiriting influence on *Le Producteur*’s shareholders. The daunting combination of financial difficulties along with sheer exhaustion was decisive<sup>119</sup> and on December 12th the six remaining devotees informed their subscribers that *Le Producteur* would be suspending publication indefinitely.<sup>120</sup> For the Saint-Simonian movement, however, this would only mark the end of the beginning.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Philippe Régnier, “*Les Saint-Simoniens, le Prêtre et l’Artiste*,” *Romantisme*, no. 67 (1990-91): 40-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>4</sup> Charléty, 25.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 150-151.
- <sup>6</sup> Charléty, 27-28.
- <sup>7</sup> Carlisle, 49 and Charléty, 31.
- <sup>8</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 151.
- <sup>9</sup> Charléty, 31.
- <sup>10</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle: Français, Historique, Géographique, Mythologique, Bibliographique, Littéraire, Artistique, Scientifique, etc. etc.*, ed. Pierre Larousse (Paris: Administration du Grand Dictionnaire Universel, 1866-1877), s.v. “Laffitte (Jacques)” and Carlisle, 211-212.
- <sup>11</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 150.
- <sup>12</sup> Carlisle, 22, 42 and *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. “Basterrèche (Jean-Pierre)”
- <sup>13</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 152, 157.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 158-159.
- <sup>15</sup> Charléty, 31.
- <sup>16</sup> Claude Bellanger ed. et al., *Histoire Générale de la Presse Française* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969), II, 68n.
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 94.
- <sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 89.
- <sup>19</sup> Jean-Jacques Goblot, *La Jeune France Libérale: Le Globe et son Groupe Littéraire: 1824-1830* (Paris: Librairie Plon 1995), 162.
- <sup>20</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. “Sacrilège.”
- <sup>21</sup> Goblot, 162.
- <sup>22</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. “Villèle (Jean-Baptiste-Séraphin-Joseph, comte de).”
- <sup>23</sup> Goblot, 162-164.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.
- <sup>25</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 150.
- <sup>26</sup> Goblot, 248.
- <sup>27</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. “Artaud (Nicolas-Louis)” and *La France Littéraire ou Dictionnaire Bibliographique des Savants, Historiens et Gens de Lettres de la France, ainsi que des Littérateurs Étrangers qui ont Écrit en Français, plus Particulièrement Pendant les XVIIIe et XIXe Siècles*, ed. Joseph-Marie Quérard (Paris: Didot, 1827-1839), s.v. “Artaud (Nic.-L.).”
- <sup>28</sup> Goblot, 248.

- 
- <sup>29</sup> Carlisle, 22, 44-48, 59, 206, 220, 227-231.
- <sup>30</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, eds. M. Prévost and Roman d'Amat (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1956), s.v. "Halévy, Léon."
- <sup>31</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. "Garnier, Adolphe."
- <sup>32</sup> Jean-Jacques Goblot, *Le Globe, 1824-1830: Documents pour Server a l'Histoire de la Presse Littéraire* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993), 147-149 and *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. "Allier, Joseph"
- <sup>33</sup> Carlisle, 44, 54 and André Berthélet ed. et al., *La Grande Encyclopédie Inventaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Lettres et des Arts* (Paris: H. Lamirault et Cie, 1886-1902), s.v. "Cerclet, Antoine."
- <sup>34</sup> Carlisle, 43-44, 120-121 and *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. "Bucheze, Philippe."
- <sup>35</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. "Blanqui (Adolphe)."
- <sup>36</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. "Bazard (Amand)" and Carlisle, 43-44, 158, 167-170 and *La Littérature Française Contemporaine*, ed. Joseph-Marie Quérard et al. (Paris: Daguin frères, 1842-1857), s.v. "Bazard [Saint-Amand]" and *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*, eds. Jean Maitron, Claude Penneret, and Michel Cordillot (Paris: l'Atelier, 1964-1997), s.v. "BAZARD, Saint-Amand."
- <sup>37</sup> *La France Littéraire*, s.v. "Senty (Ambroise)" and *Annuaire de la Société des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques* (Paris: Commission des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques, 1866-1956), II, 160 <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k55817145.image.hl.r=Senty.f169.langEN>>.
- <sup>38</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. "Carrel (Armand)" and R.-G. Nobécourt, *La Vie d'Armand Carrel* (Paris: Librairie Gallimard, 1930).
- <sup>39</sup> Charléty, 31.
- <sup>40</sup> See, for instance, de Stendhal, *D'un Nouveau Complot contre les Industriels* (Paris: Sautet et Ce, 1825), 4 <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k85600g.r=.langEN>>.
- <sup>41</sup> Léon Halévy ed., "Prospectus," *Le Producteur* 1 (1825): 3 <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k854645.image.r=Producteur.f4.langFR>>.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.
- <sup>45</sup> Prosper Enfantin, "Le Temps – L'Opinion Publique," *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 5.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.
- <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 10-11.
- <sup>49</sup> Ambroise Senty, "Revue Littéraire," *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 414.

- 
- <sup>50</sup> Joseph Allier, “*Exposition Des Ouvrages De David*,” *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 260-261.
- <sup>51</sup> Adolphe Garnier, “*De L’Art Dramatique*,” *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 605-606.
- <sup>52</sup> Philippe Buchez, “*Quelques Réflexions sur la Littérature et les Beaux-Arts*,” *Le Producteur* 4 (1826): 204.
- <sup>53</sup> Antoine Cerclet, “*Considérations Philosophiques sur la Littérature*,” *Le Producteur* 1 (1825): 57.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 58.
- <sup>55</sup> Cerclet, 49.
- <sup>56</sup> Buchez, 204.
- <sup>57</sup> Halévy, “*Prospectus*,” 5 original emphasis.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 252-253.
- <sup>62</sup> Garnier, 544.
- <sup>63</sup> Ambroise Senty, “*Théâtre Français – Léonidas, Tragédie en Cinq Actes, par M. Pichat*,” *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 213.
- <sup>64</sup> Senty, “*Revue Littéraire*,” 412.
- <sup>65</sup> Allier, “*Expositions des Ouvrages de David*,” 259.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 260.
- <sup>67</sup> Allier, “*Exposition Des Ouvrages De David*,” 257.
- <sup>68</sup> Senty, “*Théâtre Français*,” 221-222.
- <sup>69</sup> Garnier, 604.
- <sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 589-592.
- <sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 593.
- <sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 599.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 600.
- <sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 601-602.
- <sup>75</sup> Buchez, 202-203.

- 
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid., 204-205.
- <sup>77</sup> Cercllet, 51.
- <sup>78</sup> Senty, “*Revue Littéraire*,” 412.
- <sup>79</sup> Garnier, 546.
- <sup>80</sup> Allier, “*Exposition des Ouvrages de David*,” 260.
- <sup>81</sup> Bazard, 121.
- <sup>82</sup> Garnier, 545.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid., 546.
- <sup>84</sup> Cercllet, 52.
- <sup>85</sup> Ibid., 51.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid., 52.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid., 51.
- <sup>88</sup> See, for instance, James van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 182.
- <sup>89</sup> Garnier, 591.
- <sup>90</sup> Senty, “*Théâtre Français*,” 222.
- <sup>91</sup> Joseph Allier, “*Sociétés Des Amis Des Arts De Paris, Bordeaux, Lyon etc.*,” *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 51-52.
- <sup>92</sup> Allier, “*Exposition des Ouvrages de David*,” 261.
- <sup>93</sup> Léon Halévy, “*Bulletins Littéraires : No. Ier*,” *Le Producteur* 1 (1826): 126-127.
- <sup>94</sup> Ibid., 127-128.
- <sup>95</sup> Ibid., 39 original emphasis
- <sup>96</sup> Ibid., 40 original emphasis
- <sup>97</sup> Ibid., 41-42.
- <sup>98</sup> Ibid., 43.
- <sup>99</sup> Allier, “*Exposition des Ouvrages de David*,” 261.
- <sup>100</sup> Buchez, 203.
- <sup>101</sup> Enfantin, 10-11.
- <sup>102</sup> Halévy, “*Prospectus*,” 4-5.

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>104</sup> Cercllet, 55-56.

<sup>105</sup> Allier, “*Sociétés des Amis des Arts*,” 44-45.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>108</sup> Senty, “*Théâtre Français*,” 212.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 223.

<sup>110</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 165 and Carlisle, 13, 61.

<sup>111</sup> Mary Pickering, *Auguste Comte: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), I, 373-374, 378-379.

<sup>112</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 170-174.

<sup>113</sup> cited in Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin, “*Réponse au Globe*,” *Le Producteur* 4 (1826): 499-508, 500.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 501-502.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 499.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 504.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 506.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 507.

<sup>119</sup> Charléty, 43.

<sup>120</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 182-184.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE ARTIST AS EDUCATOR: THE EXPERIENCE OF HIPPOLYTE CARNOT

A quick survey of the ranks and fellow travelers of the Saint-Simonians presents no shortage of notable writers and journalists among whom the appeal and influence of the Saint-Simonian conception of the “artist” might be assessed. One early contributor to *Le Producteur*, Armand Carrel (1800-1836), left the journal in January 1826 to contribute to the liberal daily newspaper *Le Constitutionnel*. In 1830, Carrel served as one of the three co-founding editors (along with Adolphe Thiers and Francois-Auguste Mignet) of the more aggressive *National*, which played a central role in bringing about the “Three Glorious Days” and the establishment of the July Monarchy.<sup>1</sup> Among those journalists who maintained a more enduring association with Saint-Simonianism there was Adolphe Guérault (1810-1872) who joined the movement in 1827, wrote first for *Le Globe* and then for *La Revue Encyclopédique* before becoming a foreign correspondent for *Le Journal des Débats* and ultimately editor-in-chief of *La Presse*. In 1859, Guérault obtained permission to found *L’Opinion Nationale*, one of the most prominent public organs of democratic thought under the Second Empire.<sup>2</sup> A great deal has been written on Pierre Leroux (1798-1871), who was one of the co-founding editors of the originally liberal literary and philosophical journal *Le Globe* before officially putting it at the service of the Saint-Simonian movement in January of 1831. After seceding from the movement in November of the same year, Leroux went on to edit *La Revue Encyclopédique*, contribute to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and found first the *Revue Indépendante* and then the *Revue Sociale*.<sup>3</sup> In recent years, significant scholarly attention has been paid to the figure of Édouard Charton (1807-1890), a Saint-Simonian preacher



who founded the enormously successful *Magasin Pittoresque* in 1833 and served as its editor-in-chief for the next 55 years.<sup>4</sup>

Comparatively less attention has been paid to the figure of Hippolyte Carnot (1801-1888). Carnot was a journalist, activist, biographer, and ultimately a politician whose career as such, beginning with his first election to the Chamber of Deputies in 1839, spanned nearly half a century. A frequent collaborator of Pierre Leroux's and a lifelong friend of Édouard Charton, Carnot's involvement in the Saint-Simonian movement dwarfed that of either of his colleagues. Introduced to the staff of *Le Producteur* in 1825, Carnot's commitment to Saint-Simonianism steadily grew over the next several years. Finally, beginning in December of 1828, he fulfilled the vital role of redactor and publisher of the exposition of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon*, a series of public lectures delivered by Saint-Amand Bazard at which the core principles of Saint-Simonianism were elaborated before large audiences. As an adherent, Carnot thus represented a relatively early and ultimately quite important acquisition on the part of the emerging Saint-Simonian school. Far from a technocrat, Carnot's attraction to Saint-Simonianism demonstrates the nature of the movement's appeal to contemporary men of letters, and in particular the importance, in this regard, of the Saint-Simonian concept of the artist as moral educator such as it was articulated in the exposition of *The Doctrine* and during the years leading up to it. Although Carnot joined Leroux and Charton in leaving the Saint-Simonian movement in November of 1831, his subsequent writings and political career demonstrate both the ongoing influence and practical application of Saint-Simonian precepts concerning the critical importance of a centrally directed program of public education in the stabilization of the body politic. By informing the politics of

Hippolyte Carnot and those close to him, Saint-Simonianism would ultimately make an important contribution to the consolidation of liberal democracy in France.

### **A Family Connection**

The period in the development of Saint-Simonianism between 1826 and 1828—that is, between the folding of *Le Producteur* and the exposition of *The Doctrine*—is frequently described as one of “silent expansion.”<sup>5</sup> While the original group of contributors to *Le Producteur* largely went their separate ways, those who would eventually emerge as the leaders of the resurgent movement (Saint-Amand Bazard, Prosper Enfantin, and Olinde Rodrigues foremost among them) maintained contact, organized discussions, refined their ideas, and attempted to both reinvigorate old loyalties and acquire new adherents. Among those drawn back to the movement during this period, Hippolyte Carnot was a recruit of special priority, Robert Carlisle suggests, because of his varied and numerous social connections.<sup>6</sup> Carnot enjoyed something of a privileged position in 19th Century French society as a result of being the son of an almost universally revered revolutionary general and minister. Just as both Carlisle and William Reddy have emphasized the relevance of biographical details in accounting for Enfantin’s initial affinity for the teachings of Saint-Simon (specifically his father’s bankruptcy and its injurious impact on Enfantin’s subsequent marriage prospects<sup>7</sup>), Carnot’s relationship with his father as well as other members of his family suggest some initial reasons not only why the Saint-Simonians would take a special interest in him, but also why Carnot would take a special interest in them. For Hippolyte Carnot, the figure of the Saint-Simonian artist seemed to offer a much sought after vocation by which he could earn his father’s name.

Throughout Hippolyte Carnot's life, the celebrated memory of his father would tower over him, the name "Carnot" conferring not only many opportunities for social and political advancement but also an occasionally overwhelming sense of duty and obligation.\*<sup>8</sup> Hippolyte was the second son of Lazare-Nicolas-Marguerite Carnot: "The Great Carnot," as one biographer has labeled him.<sup>9</sup> Born in 1753, Lazare Carnot was trained as a military engineer and first gained public notoriety after publishing an effusive eulogy in tribute to the Marquis de Vauban, the famous erector of fortifications under Louis XIV whom Lazare adopted as his model of civic virtue. An enthusiastic supporter of the Revolution, Lazare joined the Legislative Assembly in 1792 and was entrusted with the inspection of several warfronts. He assumed considerably greater influence over military matters after becoming a member of the Committee of Public Safety in 1793. As Minister of War, he was largely responsible for transforming the hastily assembled "Levee en Masse" into an effective fighting force. He received special acclaim for his close cooperation with General Jourdan, after whose victory at Fleurus in 1794 no foreign soldier would set foot on French soil for the next twenty years. For his vital contribution to this turn of events, Lazare Carnot was immortalized as the "Organizer of Victory."

Throughout his political career, Lazare Carnot was a widely recognized paragon of republican integrity. Largely exempted of responsibility for the Terror and spared by the Thermidorean Reaction, he went on to serve as a member of the Directory before his unwillingness to compromise his radical republican principles led to his exile in 1797. A favorite of Napoleon, Lazare was permitted to return to France in 1800, serving briefly

---

\* In the introduction to the biography he wrote of his father, Hippolyte Carnot addresses his two sons directly, declaring, "It is not true, moreover, that public opinion lacks the law of justice and of equality when it holds us responsible for the name that we have received, as much to maintain it as to restore it, if there is a reason for it. We protest against the social privileges attributed to birth but cherish the obligations it imposes."

once more as Minister of War and subsequently as a member of the Tribunate. Still unwilling to compromise his beliefs, Lazare demonstrated remarkable courage by being one of the only public voices in opposition to both Napoleon's assumption of the title "First Consul for Life" in 1802 and the establishment of the Empire in 1804. More remarkable, even, was Lazare's good fortune in being permitted to go into peaceful retirement after the Tribunate was dissolved in 1807. At Presles, his country estate located some 30 miles south of Paris, Lazare was able to devote the next six years to his mathematical and other scholarly interests, as well as to the upbringing of his two young sons, Sadi and Hippolyte. In 1810, he published his most famous treatise, titled, "The Defense of Fortified Places." After Napoleon's defeat at Leipzig in 1813, Lazare again volunteered his services in defense of the Fatherland and was appointed governor of Antwerp. While he was initially reconciled with Louis XVIII, Lazare quickly grew dissatisfied with the Bourbon Restoration and would once again serve under Napoleon as Minister of the Interior during the Hundred Days.<sup>10</sup> In the wake of Waterloo and the Second Restoration, Lazare was forced into a second and permanent exile, taking the then 14-year-old Hippolyte with him. Father and son would live together first in Warsaw and then in Magdeburg, until the elder Carnot died in 1823 at the age of 70.<sup>11</sup> In the *Mémoires sur Carnot par son Fils*, the massive two volume biography of his father that he would finally complete some forty years later, Hippolyte describes the wholly uncommon level of admiration and respect that Lazare Carnot commanded throughout his adult life among both his political allies and his opponents. The son quotes the classical historian Barthold Niebuhr, a German nationalist and an opponent of the French Revolution who never knew the father personally, as having written:

[Lazare] Carnot is in some respects the greatest man of this century: his virtue is of an exquisite nature. My political ideas are different from his, and my love for him might seem an anomaly; but this love exists. If nothing remained for me in this world but a bit of bread, I would be proud to share it with Carnot.<sup>12</sup>

In the introduction to his biography, Hippolyte writes that from the moment he died, “I resolved to find, in the study of my father’s life, a compass to my own life.”<sup>13</sup> At several critical junctures in his life, Carnot’s use of this compass was particularly conspicuous. For instance, in the wake of the Revolution of 1830, Carnot claimed to have refused a seat in the Chamber of Peers because accepting such a position would have implied recognition of the principle of hereditary political privilege, of which he felt his father would have never approved.<sup>14</sup> He certainly followed his father’s example of brave defiance when, in 1852, Carnot was one of only three elected representatives to refuse to take the oath of loyalty to Napoleon III. In his biography, Carnot recounts having heard the name of Saint-Simon for the first time while on a walk with his father during their stay in Magdeburg. “He is a bold and original spirit,” the elder Carnot had said, “whose ideas merit the attention of philosophers and men of state.” It was after reading of his death in 1825, and remembering his father’s words, that the younger Carnot thought to seek out the modest school of disciples Saint-Simon had left behind.<sup>15</sup>

In his Sisyphean efforts to fill his father’s shoes, Hippolyte had a formidable competitor in the form of his older brother, Sadi. Five years Hippolyte’s senior, Nicolas-Leonard-Sadi Carnot was born in 1796 and named by their father after the famous medieval Persian poet and moralist whom Lazare greatly admired.<sup>16</sup> Unlike Hippolyte, who would be born in his maternal grandparents’ peaceful home in Saint-Omer, Sadi was born in the bustling Petit-Luxembourg Palace, which at the time was serving as the

official residence of all the members of the Directory and their families.<sup>17</sup> Their mother would often remind Hippolyte that, “Your brother was born in the midst of the cares and agitations of grandeur, you in the calm of an obscure retreat. Your constitutions show this difference of origin.”<sup>18</sup> In 1812, the 16-year-old Sadi was admitted to the *École Polytechnique* of which his father had been the co-founder some eighteen years before. Graduating a year later, Sadi quickly rose through the ranks of the French military, ultimately distinguishing himself as the only undefeated general to fight against the British in 1814. Reduced during the Restoration to doing fairly routine engineering work, Sadi was able to devote most of his time and energy to his scholarly pursuits, the most notable of which related to his interests in science and industry. In 1824 he completed his only published work, *Reflections on the Motive Power of Fire*. In this treatise, which would later be understood as representing the inception of the modern study of thermodynamics,<sup>19</sup> Sadi Carnot became the first physicist to formulate what would become known as the field’s “Second Law.”<sup>20</sup> At the time it was published, however, Sadi’s treatise garnered very little positive attention. Eight years later, Sadi’s health rapidly deteriorated and he died in relative obscurity at the age of 36.<sup>21</sup> For a later edition of the Reflections, published after Sadi’s name had come “to be placed among those of great inventors,” Hippolyte would write a preface which represents the principal historical source of information on his brother’s life and character. Hippolyte begins the preface by recognizing, “Since there remains a witness of his private life—the sole witness, has he not a duty to fulfill?”<sup>22</sup> Not content merely to elucidate the specific circumstances surrounding the inspiration and formulation of the Reflections, Hippolyte recounts a number of anecdotes illustrating the remarkable courage and moral fortitude

that Sadi demonstrated throughout his short life. Even as a small child, for instance, Hippolyte describes how Sadi was a favorite of Josephine Bonaparte, who would occasionally look after him. On one such occasion, when Josephine and a number of other ladies were relaxing by a pond, her mischievous husband suddenly appeared and began splashing them with water, much to their displeasure. No one else having the courage to say anything, the 4-year-old Sadi shook his fist at Napoleon and shouted, “Beast of a First Consul, will you stop tormenting these ladies!”<sup>23</sup> Long before composing his preface to the *Reflections*, in fact, Hippolyte’s obviously profound and longstanding admiration for his brother had found potent expression when, in 1837, he named his first born son Marie-Francois-Sadi Carnot.

Between the brothers Carnot, there was one very obvious respect in which Sadi was able to follow in their father’s footsteps and in which Hippolyte was not: in becoming a military engineer. In addition to his father and his brother, one of Hippolyte’s uncles, Claude-Marie Carnot-Feulins,<sup>24</sup> with whom his father was extremely close and on whose recollection and interpretation of events Hippolyte often relies in the *Mémoires sur Carnot*,<sup>25</sup> was also a distinguished military engineer (his other uncle, Joseph-François-Claude Carnot, was an attorney<sup>26</sup>). In marked contrast to his father, brother, and uncle, Hippolyte Carnot was never, at any point in his life, either a soldier or an engineer. While at the age of 11, Hippolyte had enrolled in the preparatory school of one Mr. Lemoine d’Essoies,<sup>27</sup> he left three years later to follow his father into exile and never attended the *Polytechnique*. In the *Mémoires*, Hippolyte recalls that Lazare had explicitly recognized that his son had renounced a career in engineering in order to accompany him.<sup>28</sup> Hippolyte would never make the same sort of contributions to society

as his elders; he would never approximate the model of the Marquis de Vauban that his father had so venerated. Ironically, considering that Saint-Simonianism is often characterized as the self-serving doctrine of proud technocrats, the man who ultimately put *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon* on paper would have been, if anything, painfully aware of *not* being a technocrat. Sixty years after his death, his grandson, Paul Carnot, would declare summarily that, “[Hippolyte’s] father had transmitted his scientific and mechanical tastes to [Sadi], as he transmitted to Hippolyte his social and educative thoughts.”<sup>29</sup> Later in life, Hippolyte likely came to recognize something to this effect himself. As a young man in his 20s, however, this equitable partition of their father’s legacy, as it were, was probably not terribly clear to him. While it had certainly not been her intended emphasis, his mother’s association of Sadi with grandeur and of him with obscurity obviously rang in Hippolyte’s ears so loudly that he would remember her words nearly 60 years after her death.<sup>†</sup> How would he be able to prove himself as worthy as his brother of bearing their father’s name? What sort of contribution was he capable of making? In his preface, Hippolyte suggests the form which his redemption would ultimately take when he recounts how Sadi asked him to proofread passages of the “Reflections,” “in order to convince himself that it would be understood by persons occupied by other studies.”<sup>30</sup> It would be through his superior communicative abilities and his capacity as a publicist that Hippolyte would prove his mettle.

### **Joining the School**

Upon his return to France from Germany in 1823, Hippolyte Carnot “dreamed,” as his grandson puts it, “of lofty destinies and of the revival of the emancipative ideas of yesteryear.” Under the Restoration, however, he was forbidden a career in government.

---

<sup>†</sup> Hippolyte composed his preface to Sadi’s *Reflections* in 1872. His mother had died in February of 1813.



In his search for a rewarding avenue of involvement, Carnot first joined the philanthropic Society of Christian Morality, founded in 1821 by Duke Francois Alexandre Frederic de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. The fundamental and most conspicuous principle of the Society was its ecumenism, inviting and acquiring the participation of prominent public figures across both political and religious divisions in the discussion and protest of the slave trade and the death penalty among other pressing social concerns. In 1825, Carnot became an adherent of the Saint-Simonian school,<sup>31</sup> although his involvement in *Le Producteur* was minimal.<sup>‡</sup><sup>32</sup> From May to November of 1828, however, Carnot played a much more active role in co-editing with Hippolyte Auger a “Journal of Morality and of Literature” titled, *Le Gymnase*. The themes explored in the pages of *Le Gymnase* serve to shed light on what were likely Carnot’s chief intellectual concerns in the months immediately leading up to his serving as redactor of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon*. These interests principally included religious and professional education, as well as the artist’s role in society,

In their Prospectus, Carnot and Auger made clear that *Le Gymnase* was dedicated to an open discussion of the topics with which it was concerned, and would therefore rely heavily on articles submitted by its readership for content. Their principal intent, in fact, was to provide a forum for all those interested in literary, political, and philosophical issues but who would otherwise lack the means of publication. “Nothing... favors the progress of illumination as much as a free discussion,” they write.<sup>33</sup> It was therefore in the general interest that such voices be heard. Carnot and Auger went on to explain that all pieces submitted to *Le Gymnase* would go before an editorial committee which would

---

<sup>‡</sup> Carnot submitted one article for publication in *Le Producteur*. The article dealt with the role of banks in the organization of agriculture, and was published anonymously.

then decide which articles to publish and in what order on the basis not of the opinions expressed in them, but of the interest they were likely to generate. This process, they write, is “indispensable in order to avoid redundancies and personal prejudices.”<sup>34</sup> Carnot and Auger thus expressed their commitment to maintaining a minimal, yet still significant, measure of editorial control.

An appreciation of *Le Gymnase*'s mode of operation permits the reader to hazard assertions as to Carnot's creative input as an editor. Because *Le Gymnase* did not invest very heavily in a permanent body of contributors, there was relatively little variety of independent authorial agendas; in fact, very few of the articles published in *Le Gymnase* are clearly attributable to any particular author, many being signed simply, “W,” or “Z,” or some other set of initials which may very well be wholly pseudonymous.<sup>§</sup> By contrast, what is certain about each article is that Carnot selected it for publication. Thus, while few of the articles can be read as straightforward articulations of Carnot's own positions, they are all, to some extent, indicative of his interests and concerns. At the end of the Prospectus, in fact, Carnot and Auger suggested a list of six questions for their prospective contributors to address, and a great many of the articles subsequently published in *Le Gymnase* explicitly adopted one or another of them as their points of departure.

Of the questions suggested in the Prospectus, one is particularly relevant to Carnot's own life experience: “Should a father direct the religious education of his children according to his personal opinions or according to the rules of the dominant religion of the country in which they are destined to live?” Having had such a large

---

<sup>§</sup> One notable exception to this general trend is a brace of fairly prosaic and awkwardly written articles submitted by an American reader named James Burton.

proportion of his education directed privately and personally by his father, the issue of how well and in what respects his unusual upbringing had served him was a frequent subject of critical reflection for Carnot. Exactly what sort of upbringing would have best prepared a child for adult life in 1820s France?

The question is approached most interestingly in two articles submitted to *Le Gymnase* by a Mr. “Gabriel V,” which could be read by Carnot as relating vaguely Saint-Simonian notions to both his past experience and his present circumstances. In his first article, Mr. V. presents the allegorical story of a “Mr. and Mrs. de C.” whose unhappy marriage of convenience had been arranged by their parents. Having virtually nothing in common, there was an extremely narrow range of activities in which they could stand to participate as a couple. They therefore agreed early in their marriage that it would be best to divide the parenting of their children in such a way that neither father nor mother would ever have to compromise or come to an agreement with the other. Thus, when they were finally blessed with twin sons, Mr. de C. had complete and exclusive parental supervision over one of the boys, while Mrs. de C. had complete and exclusive parental supervision over the other. For his part, Mr. de C. was proud to consider himself a *philosophe*, and decided to raise his son as an enlightened atheist. Mrs. de C., on the other hand, had been educated in a convent and was committed to raising her son as a devout Catholic. Time went by and each son seemed to mature just as well as the other. Then, amidst the Revolution, first Mrs. de C. and then Mr. de C were persecuted for their beliefs and forced to emigrate with their respective children. Ironically, both parents chose Italy as their destination, the one seeing it as the seat of the Church, the other as the great fountain of atheism. There, both parents would ultimately die in exile, leaving the

two sons to reunite in France following the Restoration. Mr. V. recounts the conversation between the two formerly estranged brothers on this bittersweet occasion. Each brother continues to adhere to the precepts of his upbringing, and each considers the France of the 1820s to be far more amenable to someone of his brother's religious disposition. Each feels that his own views are received with widespread contempt, that he is unwelcome in polite society, and that the prominent public personalities ostensibly on his side of the religious divide lack sincerity in their alleged convictions.<sup>35</sup>

In his second article,<sup>36</sup> Mr. V. presents a more commendable middle path as typified by a "Mr. A\*\*\*", a supposed friend of Turgot and Condorcet who decided to raise his son according to neither the "ridiculous severity" of traditional Christianity nor the "guilty indulgence" of Atheism.<sup>37</sup> Examining late 18th century society, it seemed to Mr. A\*\*\* that the rites and practices of Christianity were already terribly antiquated and were steadily being abandoned in spite of the crass machinations of the temporal authorities, who had a political interest in maintaining the tottering religious establishment. "Will I raise my son with ideas that are no longer those of today, and will have ceased to exist when he attains maturity?" Mr. A\*\*\* asks himself. "No," he concludes, "one cannot make a man for the future with the customs of the past."<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, Mr. A\*\*\* also appreciated that the religious impulse had manifested itself in one form or another at every moment in human history. "Not looking to fight a natural instinct," explains Mr. V., Mr. A\*\*\* "wanted that his son should have a religion which could find its dogma in the future."<sup>39</sup> In practice, this guiding principle meant instilling in his son a powerful sense of obligation toward his peers, which would effectively "establish for him a provisional form of religion, in anticipation of a new revelation."<sup>40</sup>

It also meant imbuing the study of the natural sciences with an aesthetic sensitivity for the divine. A brilliant student, the younger Mr. A\*\*\* found that “all of nature was explained to him by the sciences, but everything he looked at took a poetic form: the growling of the storm, the calm of the evening, the promises of spring, the harvest of autumn, the birth of a child, the death of an old man, were for him subjects of profound meditation.”<sup>41</sup> This flexible and amenable spiritual sensibility allowed the young Mr. A\*\*\* to deftly navigate the gauntlet of the Revolutionary decades. Now a grown man living under the Restoration, he is “esteemed by everyone, he is in relation with all the ideas of society.”<sup>42</sup> Possibly suggestive of the concerns shared by Carnot and his literary associates during the late 1820s, the great reward imagined by Mr. V. to be in store for a young man having acquired a proper religious education and orientation is a position of social prominence and esteem.

It is also perhaps worth appreciating the extent to which the program of religious instruction embraced by Mr. A\*\*\* resembles the one described by Carnot as having been employed by his father. In the *Mémoires*, Carnot recalls his father insisting that,

‘One is good by nature or one becomes good by education; but one can be good in professing very diverse opinions, even on religion.’ This is why, when our mother went to mass, her only practice of devotion, our father allowed us to accompany her: he thought that all homage rendered to the supreme being merited the interest of the philosopher, and that he could associate himself with it without attaching to it a particular dogmatic notion.<sup>43</sup>

Mr. A\*\*\*’s flexible religious precepts would seem similar to those of the elder Carnot, albeit informed by a greater awareness of the supposed distinction between the religion of the past and the religion of the future. Mr. A\*\*\*’s doctrine is also more Saint-Simonian

in describing a more thorough and explicit interpenetration of the arts and the sciences as well as in making a stronger claim to objective validity; Mr. A\*\*\*'s way is simply better.

Pertaining to education more generally (the topic addressed most frequently in *Le Gymnase*) the most elaborate and creative speculations are put forward in a three-part dialogue titled, “*Les Académies*,” which is also most fruitfully read bearing in mind Carnot’s personal life experience and is similarly suggestive of his increasingly Saint-Simonian standpoint on the need for greater social solidarity, the relative importance of various occupations, and the role of the artist in society. The dialogue transpires between two unnamed speakers, the first of whom offers numerous criticisms and proposals for the improvement of children’s education while being plied with coffee and questions by his companion, who generally maintains an attitude of skepticism in regards to the first speaker’s suggestions. The first part of the dialogue generally deals with questions related to the appropriate environment and context for learning. The creative speaker argues that most instruction should be conducted outside since, “genius suffers within walls, in front of a desk, in a chair.”<sup>44</sup> He imagines a system of education in which all the children of a particular city congregate in an open field planted with trees and gardens and spend most of their time playing games of some sort. “I think that it is possible,” he says, “in searching well, to find a method of teaching that does not make itself felt.”<sup>45</sup> This image offers a parallel to the one described by Carnot of his own early education in the *Mémoires*. Having spent most of his childhood at Presles, Carnot recalls that his father did not demand much formal school work from him and his brother. Far from a taskmaster, Lazare Carnot was an active participant in his sons’ games and amusements. Lazare nonetheless maintained total control over their activities and increasingly directed

them towards the most productive avenues. He taught his sons natural history, for example, by giving them pencils and encouraging them to draw their surroundings.<sup>46</sup> And yet, despite having very fond memories of his time spent at Presles, Carnot expressed a considerable degree of ambivalence regarding the merits of being taught privately by one's father. After considering the advantages of being taught amongst classmates, he implies that anyone without access to the same father and a teacher would be better served in public education.<sup>47</sup> In "*Les Académies*," when the critical speaker tentatively suggests that "in particular the education of the spirit and the heart are formed better under the continual surveillance of a father," the creative speaker responds vehemently to the contrary that "it is in the heart of the family that all faults are born." It is rather in the highest interest of both the individual child and the broader society that children from all classes and backgrounds be educated together, away from their familial enclaves and thus "come to confound themselves in a similar thought."<sup>48</sup>

The second part of "*Les Académies*" deals with the grooming of children for their future vocations. As for which vocations ought to be encouraged, the creative speaker asks early on, "Is it not a prejudice to consider the military and legal professions 'noble'? ...I see that at all times 'noble' and 'idle' [*oisif*] have been synonyms."<sup>49</sup> "Prove to me," he goes on to demand most provocatively,

that it is useful to meditate on the *Corpus juris*, to quote Latin, in order to demonstrate that my neighbor trespassed on my meadow; to know "The Defense of Fortified Places," and how to load a gun during a pitched battle; prove to me that all of this serves humanity in its march and tendency towards a more tranquil future.<sup>50</sup>

The striking reference to Lazare Carnot's most famous treatise immediately raises questions of authorship. The article is one of those signed simply, "Z." Could the author

be Hippolyte Carnot himself? Who else would have submitted such a deprecatory remark for publication in a journal edited by the son of the celebrated “Organizer of Victory”? Regardless of its authorship, the principal assertion of the second part of “*Les Académies*,” would have certainly resonated with Carnot. Besides the vocations traditionally awarded the highest level of respect (the vocations pursued by Carnot’s father, brother, and uncles) there are plenty of other callings of equal if not greater dignity. In choosing a vocation, no young man should weigh any considerations apart from his own native dispositions. Under his proposed system of education, the creative speaker says, “students can see, interrogate, and handle the instruments of the art that makes them smile the most.”<sup>51</sup> Under such encouragement, he concludes, “The artist will know to take his place.” The speaker immediately clarifies that by “artist” he means neither “the poet, nor the musician, nor the painter, nor the sculptor” but rather “he who animates these specialties, who renders them popular, who gives them a direction, an objective.... When society knows where it is going, there will be artists who hasten its march.”<sup>52</sup> Here, in *Le Gymnase* just as in *Le Producteur*, one recognizes the figure of the artist as publicist, communicator, and ultimately as shepherd. The vocation of such an artist, the dialogue suggests, demands the highest respect and encouragement.

The third part of “*Les Académies*,” along with numerous other articles appearing in *Le Gymnase*, deals with the pressing need for social and spiritual unity and direction as well as the artist’s responsibility to provide that unity and direction. “The true poet,” claims the creative speaker, “does not have an individual opinion, he feels like everyone, he is the organ of everyone.”<sup>53</sup> When the critical speaker points out the anti-liberalism of the creative speaker’s notions, the latter responds, “What would you like me to do about



this? With my unity of social direction, I still leave each individual to fulfill the employ to which his capacities destine him.”<sup>54</sup> The two speakers ultimately part company with the critical speaker still unconvinced of either the desirability or the practicability of the creative speaker’s proposals. “Adieu, poor fool!” he says as he departs. “Poor blind man!” the creative speaker responds, “You do not know where you walk.”<sup>55</sup> The image of the visually impaired or otherwise bewildered man in desperate need of guidance and foresight recurs in several other articles as well. The author (“W.”) of an article concerning the “Establishment and Direction of Free Primary Schools for Adults” argues that insufficient material has been composed for adults who have just recently learned to read. “To teach a people to read is to give them legs in order to walk,” he claims. “It remains to tell them where they should go.”<sup>56</sup> Similarly, the author of an article critical of a public course in philosophy taught by Victor Cousin, argues that the renowned professor has failed to fulfill his proper public role. Appealing to Dr. Cousin directly, the author asks,

Who are they, these disciples which the country confides in you? Having hastened from the depths of the provinces in order to climb to the spring of higher education, alienated from the religious surveillance of the family, most of them find themselves lost without a guide in an immense city. Many are especially interested in the physical sciences, which, by a mean direction towards the least elevated doctrines, compromise the nobility of their sentiments.... Be the guide that they call for.<sup>57</sup>

Yet again in good Saint-Simonian fashion, it falls to the public men of letters to imbue the practice of the sciences with nobility and moral direction.

It is with regard to their inability to either achieve or engender such unity and direction that the contributors to *Le Gymnase* find fault in several prominent contemporary philanthropic organizations and in Carnot’s own Society of Christian

Morality in particular. The author of one article declares that “The existence of [the Society of Christian Morality] is more remarkable than the results obtained by it.”<sup>58</sup> He commends the Society’s detachment from any particular church or national sentiment but offers harsh criticism of a statement made by Francois Guizot, one of the Society’s more prominent members, to the effect that “each of the members of the Society may have particular opinions on the questions of morality and of politics, but that this was not at all an obstacle to the activity of everyone following a common direction.” The author of the article finds this assertion very doubtful. “It seems to us,” he contends to the contrary, “that action being a result of thought, there couldn’t possibly be a unity of action but where there is a unity of thought.”<sup>59</sup> This assessment appears to be borne out in a later article’s account of the fate of a proposal put before the Society by none other than Carnot himself. At the meeting of July 14<sup>th</sup>, the article recounts, Mr. Carnot suggested that the Society support the foundation of worker-owned and operated factories in an effort to eliminate beggary in Paris. Despite extensive discussion of the proposal’s merits and compelling rationale, disagreement within the Society with respect to basic principles of Political Economy prompted the directors to table the project indefinitely pending yet further discussion.<sup>60</sup> Carnot can hardly have found this a fulfilling outcome.

This same lack of unity and direction, combined with his growing commitment to Saint-Simonianism, appears to have been the cause of Carnot’s eventual disaffection with *Le Gymnase* as an enterprise. While most of the articles in *Le Gymnase* addressed themes and concerns roughly similar to those articulated in *Le Producteur*, the responses to those concerns proposed by the contributors to *Le Gymnase* were often not terribly clear or compelling. One article on “The Current Crisis of the Theatre” presents a critique

of the commercialist corruption of dramatic art which would fit in comfortably enough among the pages of *Le Producteur*, but its tone is more cynical than constructive. The article condemns the desire for unity and direction it associates disparagingly with the specters of Napoleon and Louis XIV in addition to what the author perceives as the common starry-eyed anticipation of a miraculous theatrical efflorescence at some vaguely defined future date.<sup>61</sup> Another article titled, “Against the Industrial Tendency of the Century” presents a similarly mixed bag of vaguely Saint-Simonian and decidedly un-Saint-Simonian notions. The author, a self-proclaimed industrial and merchant, condemns the commercialization of journalism and literature in particular and its deleterious effects on both the dignity of writers and the quality of their written products. “At the Society of Christian Morality,” the author declaims, “one shouts a great deal against the treatment of the Negroes, and well enough! But sir, markets of this sort go on every day in Paris which do not excite the smallest murmur. Many of our authors are sold, they and their pen.”<sup>62</sup> The fundamental problem the author identifies, however, is that writers and artists more generally are no longer willing to resign themselves to lives of desperate poverty. “One used to say, ‘Beg like a painter,’” the author recalls, “That was the good time for them.”<sup>63</sup> Most aspiring writers and artists would be forgiven for not considering returning to such a past to be a terribly constructive suggestion. When *Le Gymnase* suspended publication in November of 1828, Carnot composed a Postscriptum in which he explained that

In the fear of shocking certain individual opinions, we believed it prudent not to declare the principles of the doctrine on which this journal was based. But experience having demonstrated to us that what resulted from these fears and precautions was an intellectual mosaic which resembled in some ways the eclecticism that it had been our intention to bridge, we

have felt the necessity to assert more unity in the redaction of our Journal in the future.<sup>64</sup>

*Le Gymnase* never resumed publication. Less than two months later, Carnot was busy redacting the exposition of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon*.

The extent to which the teachings of the resurgent Saint-Simonian movement corresponded to the concerns of the 27-year old Carnot can be illustrated with reference to one particularly significant work written by Enfantin in 1828: “The Memoirs of an Industrial of the year 2240,” which Carlisle declares, “the clearest projection of the Saint-Simonian vision”<sup>65</sup> produced in the entire pre-expository interlude. The title of this extended essay makes a clear reference to Louis-Sebastien Mercier’s enormously popular, “The Year 2440: A Dream if Ever There Was One,” written some 57 years earlier. Both works present a vision of an ideal European society set at some distant point in the future. By framing his work as a memoir instead of a dream, however, and by situating his projected society two hundred years closer to the present, Enfantin places greater emphasis on the actual attainability of such a society, a society which might very well take shape sooner than one might expect. “2240” is written from the imagined first person perspective of an industrial administrator coming to the end of a long and enormously fulfilling life as a member of the ideal society of the future. By offering a thorough account of each phase in his life, the narrator also provides a comprehensive description of the prevailing organization of that society.

“2240” begins with a lengthy account of the narrator’s early childhood, lavishing attention on his relationship with his parents and on the system of education through which he passed. These are the first respects in which Enfantin’s concerns complement those of the contemporary Carnot as illustrated in *Le Gymnase*. The narrator emphasizes

the importance of having been taken out of the home and educated among other children his own age. All of the children having come from different walks of life, the narrator was thus exposed to a much broader range of productive activities than simply those in which his own father was involved. Being educated outside of the home also allowed him to cultivate a sense of affection and loyalty not just for his immediate family, but also for a far larger group of people, the “great family,” as he calls it. But this, according to the narrator, was not so much a matter of suppressing familial affections as one of heightening and extending them. “I wanted to know and love this great family,” he writes, “because there one depicted it under the forms which recalled to me my love for my father, for my tender mother.”<sup>66</sup>

Yet while *Enfantin* portrays the bonds of the family as the model and basis of all other social bonds, he insists that the best interests of everyone occasionally lie in curbing parental influence. It must never be a foregone conclusion, for instance, that a child should enter the profession of his father, as there always remains a significant probability, in spite of all his inevitably inherited habits and dispositions, that a child might be poorly-suited to such activity. The narrator recounts how immediately after completing their primary education, all the children were sorted according to their particular set of aptitudes and sent to one of four secondary schools, there being one school for industry, one for the sciences, one for the fine arts, and one for those “privileged” students who manifest comparable talents in all three fields of productive activity. This all-important sorting was conducted by a corps of special examiners, who, while advised of the opinions of each student’s parents and teachers, ultimately based their decisions on their own observations and assessments. “This decision,” the narrator claims, “even

enlightened the parents as to the true interest of their children, an interest that they hadn't perceived except sentimentally and without the application of positive observation of the real disposition of the child, and not judging his aptitudes but by their own desires."<sup>67</sup>

The sorting is thus not depicted as an onerous, invasive bureaucratic procedure, but rather, as a clarifying and liberating experience. While it may seem severe to classify and dictate a child's future at so young an age, the narrator makes clear that the specific sorting process at the end of primary school is only the first of many subsequent sortings students undergo as they are gradually directed toward their ideal careers. At every step in the sorting process, a path is always reserved for those whose talents seem most general, thus postponing any imposition of direction until it is clearly appropriate. The sorting according to official evaluations of a student's various aptitudes is conceived as a more flexible alternative in every way preferable to the sorting according to class and family background that would inevitably take place otherwise. Furthermore, the students of each of the four schools continue to associate with one another and sometimes attend the same classes so that the disciplinary divisions tend to blur around the edges. For instance, students of all professional disciplines continued to receive "Moral Instruction," the purpose of which was to allow the students "to touch the joys and pains of humanity" and to "initiate" them into "the present state of public affairs."<sup>68</sup>

The narrator recounts how he was initially sent to the secondary school of industry, but was subsequently directed down the most general of paths so that, being knowledgeable in the general character of the widest possible range of industrial activities as well as in their potential combinations, he made an ideal high-level administrator. Working as such, he had the greatest opportunity to work closely with

practitioners of the other disciplines. Carlisle claims that the Industrial from whose perspective “2240” is recounted “is Enfantin in fantasy.... In the picture of unending toil, the mobilization of capital and men, the flowering of deserts and the leveling of mountains one senses the apotheosis of the businessman and the engineer.”<sup>69</sup> This interpretation, however, ignores the light in which those who instead fulfill the artistic/spiritual/educative function are portrayed. Describing how he learned as a child to feel connected to the “great family,” the narrator first recounts how, “I saw there these fathers of the fatherland, these industrials who nourished it with their efforts.” But in addition to those fulfilling the industrial function, the narrator goes on to declare,

my heart also flew before those men who, full of a truly maternal love, suffer with humanity, sing its joys, sympathize with it in all its moments; I admired ultimately those who, still resembling my parents, guide the weak in their uncertain march, signaling dangers to them, explaining the resources of their position, and teaching them, in a word, to know the phenomena that surround them.<sup>70</sup>

According to Saint-Simonian classifications, the narrator is describing the artists fulfilling their function as communicators and educators, and in a far more effusive manner than that in which he just described the industrials.

“2240” in fact culminates in an extended panegyric to one artist in particular, a man who makes a singular contribution to the final mission on which the narrator is dispatched by the European Congress. Early in his professional life, the narrator had taken part in the foundation of a Western European colony in Caucasian Georgia, which had prospered and grown enormously over the intervening decades. The defect which the narrator was ultimately sent back to rectify was the persistent inequality between the colonists and the indigenous Georgians which had not diminished over time according to the planners’ hopes and expectations. The crux of the problem, as the narrator sees it,

was that economic development had outpaced cultural development. “Industry is but one of the means of social prosperity,” he asserts. He proposed that, “in the cities wherein the material state was most flourishing, where industry had made the most progress, the government ought to accord the necessary funds for the erection of a temple, of a museum, of a school.”<sup>71</sup> But the narrator was principally sent back to Georgia to provide material and technical assistance to “a man who had other titles than mine to the confidence and love of the peoples of Georgia, and whose accompanying eloquence should bring conviction to all hearts.” This man, a director of public art projects, had been the one to initially solicit assistance from the central authorities. He was responsible for orchestrating a vast campaign “to persuade the weak, the colonists and the indigenous people that they were the children of the same family, that they derived life from the same source, that they all obeyed the sovereign decrees which presided over the destinies of the human species.”<sup>72</sup> “It was to the virtuous friend who accompanied me,” the narrator ultimately concludes, “the religious philanthrope, the passionate preacher... that it belongs to restore light upon these sublime beliefs, these celestial truths.”<sup>73</sup> If there is any apotheosis playing out in “2240,” it is an apotheosis of the artist, not the engineer.

By comparing the themes of “2240” to those of *Le Gymnase*, the various causes for Carnot’s interest in and attachment to Saint-Simonianism become obvious. The young Carnot sought a firm sense of belonging and direction; an understanding of history and society according to which, by pursuing his own particular talents and the avenues open to him at the time, he could occupy a position of dignity and influence and thereby honor his father’s name without having to follow in his exact footsteps. Saint-



Simonianism seemed to offer just such an understanding. In the Saint-Simonian conception of the artist and his vital public function as communicator and educator, Carnot could easily see himself. Furthermore, the Saint-Simonian school, being founded on and dedicated to the furthering of a definite set of social, political, and religious precepts, appeared initially to be a far more promising associative model for effective philanthropic activism than the ecumenism of the Society of Christian Morality that Carnot had found so frustrating.

But in addition to Carnot's own personal quest, as a young man of letters, for a sense of self-worth and fulfillment, a broader social concern links the discourse of Carnot's *Gymnase* with the writings of Enfantin as represented by "2240." Both share a profound appreciation for the fact that social concord and solidarity are not the natural way of things. For all of their preoccupation with the future, Carnot and Enfantin understand that time alone will not bring about peace and harmony. Left to their own devices, individuals, families, classes, and races will isolate themselves from one another and lose awareness of any common bond or interest. Effective cooperative action requires a common foundation of belief—a spiritual community, even—which can only be engendered through the persistent and dedicated intervention of those most intuitively sensitive to the needs and destiny of humanity.

### **The Exposition of the Doctrine: 1828-1830**

#### **a. The First Year: The Artist as Moral Educator**

By late 1828, the central "College" of leading Saint-Simonians had grown sufficiently confident in their shared beliefs and sense of mission to plan a series of public lectures that would hopefully serve to introduce the essentials of Saint-

Simonianism to an uninitiated and wider audience. The more recent and peripheral adherents to the movement (those of “second degree”) were encouraged to bring their friends. The crowd that arrived at Enfantin’s apartment on the night of December 17th greatly exceeded the planners’ expectations, and the subsequent sessions of the Exposition would be held at a much larger public meeting hall on Rue Taranne. There would ultimately be thirty sessions in total: seventeen in the first year and thirteen in the second year. Each session was discussed and planned collectively by the College (whose membership was subject to change, but which principally included Enfantin, Bazard, Olinde and Eugene Rodrigues, Paul-Mathieu Laurent, and during the first year, Philippe Buchez), delivered most often by Bazard (although Enfantin and Olinde Rodrigues took turns as well), and subsequently redacted by Carnot. The final document was thus the product of an exceptionally collaborative endeavor to which Carnot made a significant contribution.<sup>74</sup> As an event, the exposition represented the culmination of the preceding period of theoretical discussion and exploration amongst the devotees whose school had successfully expanded well beyond the confines of Saint-Simon’s original circle of personal acquaintances, and which was poised to emerge as a major social movement. It was also the point at which Saint-Simonian notions of education and the social function of the artist, notions central to the school’s appeal to a man like Carnot, attained their most thorough, definite and systematic articulation.

In addition to summarizing and codifying the ideas that had been steadily brewing in Saint-Simonian circles for nearly four years, *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon* made several bold ideological strides. For instance, much of the first five sessions of the first year were devoted to defining and reinforcing the distinction between “organic” and

“critical” epochs in human history, the former periods being characterized by widespread unity of thought and action with the latter being marked by political, intellectual and spiritual crisis. While this philosophical-historical dichotomy had been established by Saint-Simon himself (above all in his *Catechism of the Industrials*<sup>75</sup>), it was never explicitly asserted in *Le Producteur* and only first appeared in Enfantin’s correspondence in a letter dated September 30<sup>th</sup>, 1828.<sup>76</sup> The increasing prominence of the “organic”/“critical” dichotomy, which implied both a generally positive view of the Middle Ages and a generally negative view not only of the early 19th century but of all European history since the Reformation, is indicative of the growing influence among the Saint-Simonians of conservative romantics like Louis de Bonald, Joseph Marie de Maistre, and above all, Pierre-Simon Ballanche, who published the first and second volumes of his *Essais de Palingénésie Sociale* in 1827 and 1829 respectively.<sup>77</sup>

Within the Exposition, the initial extended elaboration of the distinction between “organic” and “critical” epochs in human history serves to lay the groundwork for the subsequent discourse pertaining to education. Early in the ninth session, the Saint-Simonians define education provocatively as “The collection of efforts employed in order to appropriate each new generation to the social order to which it is called by the march of humanity.” In their critical annotated edition of *The Doctrine* published in 1924, Elie Halévy and C. Bouglé call attention to the essentially “sociological” character of this definition.<sup>78</sup> For the Saint-Simonians, education was fundamentally a process of socialization, very broadly defined, and an essential instrument by which humanity’s historical mission was to be carried out. The exposition goes on to distinguish between two types of education: “Special or Professional Education,” tailored to the demands of

each individual's particular vocation, and "General or Moral Education," the purpose of which is "the inculcation into individuals of sympathy and love for all, the union of all wills in one sole will, and the direction of all efforts toward one common goal, the goal of society." Characteristically of the critical epoch in the midst of which humanity found itself in the late 1820s, "Moral education is almost entirely neglected." This neglect resulted not only from public indifference, but from "an absolute prejudice against the very thought of systematizing and reorganizing moral education."<sup>79</sup> The Saint-Simonians proceed to confront this prejudice by calling attention to the great irony of liberal thinkers and politicians who find no discomfort whatsoever in the "negative" correction of anti-social behavior through the violent and coercive enforcement of the penal code,<sup>80</sup> declaring at the same time their horror at the suggestion of the alternative and far gentler "positive" correction of anti-social behavior through a "systematic and orderly" program of moral education.

At every stage in its historical development, the exposition argues, society requires a significant measure of direction. What distinguishes the organic epoch from the critical epoch are the proportions of that direction assumed by education and "legislation" (meaning coercion and punishment) respectively. The corrective role of legislation increases in prominence only to the extent that education falls short, or, as the exposition puts it, "Laws regulate only that which has not been regulated by education.... The highest stage of perfection to be attained through the development of education," therefore, "would consist in reducing the need for coercive legislation to the cases of sinister abnormality only."<sup>81</sup> For the Saint-Simonians, the inverse relationship between "moral education" and "legislation" is essentially identical to the inverse relationship

drawn by Gramsci between the apparatus of hegemony and the coercive apparatus of the state. In effect, the Saint-Simonians' concept of "moral education" and Gramsci's concept of "hegemony" are, to a certain degree, synonymous.

In the tenth session, the Saint-Simonians extend their conception of moral education as not simply a crucial rite of passage for children, but an ongoing necessity for adults as well; as not merely the preferable remedial response to criminality, but the *sine qua non* of all effective public discourse and decision-making. In support of these two related claims, the Saint-Simonians provide a description of political life as it was enjoyed in classical antiquity. In the ancient polis, they assert,

Each citizen—the numerous class of the slaves is, of course, not included under this heading—called upon to discuss the interests of the community in the forum and to take part in the enterprises undertaken in the public interest found himself in a position high enough to perceive the relationship between his personal acts and the general interests.<sup>82</sup>

The notion of a privileged and elevated perspective from which the viewer may better appreciate the full scope of the matter under consideration is a recurring theme throughout the Exposition. For instance, it is by virtue of their enjoying such a position, the Saint-Simonians argue, that as much capital as possible should be concentrated in the hands of the directors of a centralized banking network.<sup>83</sup> On several occasions, simply having knowledge of the Doctrine of Saint-Simon is described as granting the disciple something of an elevated vantage point.<sup>84</sup> For the citizen of the classical polis, such a perspective was provided not only by his material circumstances, not only by the formal education he received as a child, but also by the invigorating cultural life in which he was immersed as an adult. The classical citizen was surrounded by "the pomp of the Olympic games, the mysteries, the religious ceremonies, the numerous class of priests, sybils, and

augurers. Everywhere a living instruction in the destiny of society awakened devotion and enthusiasm.” The Exposition proceeds to contrast this classical ideal with the political and social conditions of the present. In short,

This situation has changed. Peoples are no longer confined to the interior of a city and no longer have room in a public place where the common interests can be debated by all. The division of labor, one of the essential conditions of the progress of civilization, which restricted individuals to increasingly more limited circles, also increasingly removed them from the direct consideration of general interests, and this at the time when these interests were becoming more difficult to grasp because of increasingly complicated social relations. As the division of labor became more extensive, it was necessary to put more emphasis on intensive and orderly moral education.... In this way alone could man regain the general outlook which he had lost through specialization.<sup>85</sup>

This remarkable passage manages to describe, in all its essentials, nothing short of a structural transformation of the public sphere, and one strikingly similar to the one described by Habermas in several respects. According to both accounts, economic development led to greater class divisions and new sorts of social conflicts. These in turn intruded into the public sphere, destroying any sense of common interest and with it the possibility of arriving at a general consensus through rational discussion and debate. Unlike Habermas, however, the Saint-Simonians did not imagine there to have been a golden age of rational, effective public discourse taking place at some point during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Inhabitants of the early 19th century themselves, the Saint-Simonians were confronted by a state of decadence in public discourse that they perceived as long-standing. Their proposed remedy for this state of affairs was (in some respects) fairly straightforward: the fundamental basis of effective public discourse was and had always been “intensive and orderly moral education.” Put in slightly different but essentially commensurate terms, it was hegemony that gave the public sphere coherence.

Having firmly established both the purpose and vital importance of moral education, the Saint-Simonians direct their attention to the question of what group of men, which sector of productive society, ought to preside over its implementation. The answer put forward initially by the Saint-Simonians is, unsurprisingly enough, the “artists.”<sup>86</sup> Social solidarity, they point out, is after all fundamentally a phenomenon of shared sentiment rather than rationality. A cursory examination of history reveals, according to the Saint-Simonians, “that society has never been directly stirred onward except by the various expressions of feeling.” “One will find,” consequently, “that the direction of society has at all times and in all places belonged to the men who have spoken to the heart,”<sup>87</sup> that is to say, as per the established Saint-Simonian formulation, to the artists.

In describing all human sociability as fundamentally grounded in sentiment and in assigning artists such a weighty social responsibility, the Saint-Simonians were both remaining consistent in the conceptions and precepts they had maintained since the days of *Le Producteur* as well as directly confronting the teachings of Auguste Comte, against whom most of the latter part of the first year of the Exposition was either implicitly or explicitly directed. According to Comte, positive science and rationality were the highest and noblest of human capacities, the progressive perfection of which constituted the grand mission in light of which all of human history was to be understood and appreciated. Comte had worked as Saint-Simon’s secretary for seven years before bitter disagreements with his employer prompted him to give up the position.<sup>88</sup> Mostly for financial reasons<sup>89</sup>, Comte had contributed a significant number of articles to *Le Producteur* but had never participated in any of the editorial meetings<sup>90</sup> and did not

associate with the Saint-Simonian school after 1826. Nonetheless, he continued to bill himself to his readers and listeners as a “Student of Saint-Simon” and on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 1829 began delivering a public “Course in Positive Philosophy,” which many prominent members of Parisian intellectual society regularly attended. The members of the Saint-Simonian school consequently viewed Comte as a dangerous heretic<sup>91</sup> with whom they had to compete if they were to fully appropriate the legacy of their master.<sup>92</sup> They therefore made a great effort in the exposition of *The Doctrine* to present themselves in diametric opposition to Comte. The inability of scientists to effectively direct moral education,<sup>93</sup> the fundamental insufficiency and fruitlessness of scientific inquiry conducted in the absence of sentimental inspiration,<sup>94</sup> and the consequently vital role to be fulfilled by the artist in the realization of their projected society, were all positions presented by the Saint-Simonians in the Exposition as distinguishing their doctrine from that of Comte and thus essentially as selling points.

But the confrontation with Comte would ultimately serve to accentuate the latent religious dimension of Saint-Simonianism, a development that would shortly lead to the subordination of the role of the “artist” to that of the “priest.” A subject of major concern in the latter part of the first year and one that would lay the foundation for the entire second year of the Exposition was the “Religious Question,” on which rested one of the more profound disagreements between Comte and the Saint-Simonians. At the beginning of the thirteenth session, the Saint-Simonians articulate this question as, “Has mankind a religious future?”<sup>95</sup> That is to say, can the role of religion in public political, cultural, and intellectual life be expected to become more or less prominent in the decades and centuries to come? As a result, should the religious impulse be considered progressive or



retrograde? Comte had previously articulated a position to which the Saint-Simonians presume most of their listeners and readers will be sympathetic: religion was appropriate to earlier stages in the history of human intellectual development. These earlier stages, while having been historically necessary, were nonetheless decidedly inferior to the emergent “positive” stage of human understanding in which religion has no place. According to Comte, therefore, religion belonged in the past, not the future. The Saint-Simonians, by contrast, asserted that while critical epochs are necessarily atheistic, organic epochs are necessarily religious. One should therefore expect the organic epoch of the not-too-distant future to be dominated by a religious sensibility. The Saint-Simonians tentatively elaborated and defended this argument over the course of the last several sessions of the first year of the Exposition, presuming a significant degree of skepticism on the part of their listeners/readers. As they did so, however, the Saint-Simonians grew steadily more confident in their use of religious terminology, a trend ultimately culminating in the declaration made at the end of the first session of the second year of the Exposition to the effect that “the doctrine of Saint-Simon... is a religion.”<sup>96</sup>

Shortly before the introduction of “The Religious Question,” the contributors to the exposition had already suggested their frustration with the terminology that until then had been used to describe the figure of the artist and his role in society. Whereas in the first nine sessions of the Exposition, the Saint-Simonians make confident and unequivocal use of the terms “artist” and “fine arts” to denote what by 1829 was for them a well-established set of referents, in the tenth session the term “fine arts” appears in quotation marks. At this particular juncture, the exposition asserts that the sentimental means by which society is united and directed are referred to as “fine arts” only during

critical epochs; during organic epochs, these means are referred to as “cult.”<sup>97</sup> The “fine arts,” it would seem, are merely a substitute. When, in the eleventh session, the artists explicitly receive responsibility for the direction of moral education, the contributors make a provocative disclaimer: “We just used an expression which doubtless will be misunderstood, namely the term ‘artists.’... We shall later replace it by another word which we shall not yet use.”<sup>98</sup> The terms ultimately to take the place of “artist” are suggested towards the end of the twelfth session, when the contributors make reference to “the terrible words **clergy** and **priest**.”<sup>99</sup>

In the second year of the Exposition, in fact, it is the figure of the priest who appears everywhere and the figure of the artist almost nowhere. It is the priest who “embraces society in its unity,” and whose responsibility it is to govern both science<sup>100</sup> and industry<sup>101</sup> and above all “to ceaselessly remind men of their destination, to make them love it, to inspire their efforts by which they may attain it, to coordinate these efforts, to pursue them to their end.”<sup>102</sup> The term “artist” appears only long enough for the contributors to explain that they no longer mean, as they once did,

to employ alternatively the name of artist and the name of priest as being perfectly synonymous. [Although] the artist and the priest live in the same sphere and are of the same family... there exists between them an important difference.... The priest conceives the future and produces the regulation which links the past destinies of humanity to its future destinies; in other terms, the priest governs. The artist seizes the thought of the priest, he translates it into his own language, and by incarnating it in all the forms that it can assume, he renders it sensible to everyone.<sup>103</sup>

Under the second year of the Exposition, the artist remains essentially a communicator but is no longer a shepherd in the fullest sense.

The first year of the Exposition of *The Doctrine of Saint Simon* thus represents a pivotal moment in the development of the Saint-Simonian conception of the artist. On

the one hand, the text articulates what had until then been the most extensive and lofty description of the artist's crucially important mission as moral educator. On the other hand, the first year of the exposition also clearly foreshadows the approaching moment when the artist would be subordinated to the authority of the priesthood.

#### **b. The Second Year: The Cult of Authority**

The second year of the Exposition tends to attract far less attention than the first. As a published document the second year has undergone far fewer editions and, unlike the first year, has never been deemed worthy of English translation. In some sense this relative neglect is to be expected considering the character of the text. The second year, unlike the first, does not address an audience of the uninitiated. Rather, the second year presumes that its audience has faithfully listened to, read, or otherwise kept up with the Exposition up until that point, so that the main arguments and fundamental principles of the first year warrant only a very brief reiteration. The approach of the second year is not introductory, but exploratory. The tone is much less rhetorical and far more academic. But perhaps more importantly, by declaring Saint-Simonianism a religion at the outset, proceeding to discuss finer points of theology as well as the need for a hierarchical priesthood on the model of the Catholic Church, and by concluding with the introduction of the concept of the "living law," the second year of the Exposition in some sense marks the juncture at which many readers over the past 180 years have simply stopped taking Saint-Simonianism seriously. For those interested in Saint-Simonian notions of authority and public discourse, however, the second year of the Exposition demands serious examination, as it is in this text that the Saint-Simonian concern for social and religious hierarchy is most fully developed and expressed.

After reiterating the distinction between critical and organic epochs in human history, the Saint-Simonians suggest that in order to ascertain the proper means of directing humanity towards a new organic epoch it may be useful to investigate the historical circumstances under which the previous organic epoch—i.e., the one enjoyed by Western Europeans during the middle ages—established itself.<sup>104</sup> Over the next four sessions of the Exposition, the Saint-Simonians present a lengthy and impressively detailed historical narrative encompassing the millennium that transpired between the original inception of Christianity and the pontificate of Gregory VII. The teleology of this narrative is quickly transparent and ultimately explicit. The Saint-Simonians argue that the essential basis of the organic social order of the middle ages was the emergence of the Pope as a universally recognized spiritual authority situated at the head of a unified and hierarchical priesthood. Contrary to the claims of some Catholic historians, they assert, this was not a preeminence enjoyed by the Bishop of Rome from the very foundation of the Church, but initially only a latent primacy that had to be gradually and assiduously cultivated over the centuries.<sup>105</sup>

In their survey of the intervening period, the Saint-Simonians present two examples of the effective use of temporal authority in facilitating the march of history towards its ultimate objective. Both of these models serve to illustrate the Saint-Simonians' understanding of the mechanics of public discourse. They portray Emperor Constantine as their first model of temporal authority as demonstrated by his involvement in the convocation of the Council of Nicea. Prior to the Council, the bishop of Alexandria had condemned the heretic Arius, who had successfully managed to appeal the decision to several neighboring bishops and was continuing to propagate his

controversial precepts. Although Constantine was in no way interested in the finer points of the theological dispute, he was alarmed by the considerable disorder the ongoing disagreement within the clergy seemed to be provoking among the common people. The emperor's initial response was to write personal letters to both Arius and the Bishop of Alexandria, imploring the two of them to come to some sort of an agreement. When this approach failed, Constantine organized a general council of the Church at Nicea, which, among other things, managed to conclusively condemn the Arian heresy. The emperor reportedly received the decisions of the Council "with submission and respect." His modesty notwithstanding, it was clearly the Constantine's intervention in the controversy which had proven decisive. After all, "it was by his authority that the councils assembled, it was by that authority at least that their resolutions became binding."

Although the Saint-Simonians, in their account of the incident, consider it regrettable that this authority should have been one ultimately based upon force of arms, "in default of a moral sanction, which could not have presented itself without the existence of a constituted ecclesiastical hierarchy, [the imperial authority] alone was capable of maintaining some order in the church."<sup>106</sup> It is worth noting, however, by precisely what means the Saint-Simonians imagined the imperial authority to have maintained this order: not by imposing an arbitrary ruling by force, but by organizing discussion and effectively making consensus possible.

The Saint-Simonians reserve greater admiration, however, for their second exemplary potentate. Charlemagne, according to the Saint-Simonians' interpretation, was profoundly "capable of appreciating the civilizing mission of Christianity and animated by the desire to see this mission accomplished." Like Constantine before him,

it was Charlemagne who “convoked the councils [of the Church], who determined the object of their meeting, who sanctioned their decrees and had them carried out.” But Charlemagne went further. He sent inspectors (the “*missi dominici*”) into the provinces and ordered them “to visit the churches, the monasteries, and to make sure that the regular and secular clergies lived according to the rule appropriate to each of them.” Moreover, “He established the proper conduct that the members of the clergies should follow in the debates which could arise among them, and reserved to himself the right to pronounce supremely on those of these debates which could not end in the form that he prescribed.” More significant, even, was Charlemagne’s role as educator. The Saint-Simonians recount that at the time of his reign,

the intelligence of the sacred books and writings of the fathers of the church had been obscured, and the texts themselves of these works had been altered. Charlemagne had these texts reviewed and corrected by the most capable men of his epoch, and in order to take precautions against the inconveniences of vicious interpretations, which the ignorant priests had been able to put forward, he composed for them a collection of homilies that they should learn by heart and content themselves to recite to the people. Finally, in order to halt the progress of ignorance and to prevent its return, he instituted schools within the churches and the monasteries which were destined to give to those who proposed to embrace the ecclesiastical or monastic life, the instruction which this profession demanded.<sup>107</sup>

Lest all this centralized regulation appear a heavy-handed attempt to subvert the power of the church to his own benefit, the Saint-Simonians maintain that Charlemagne’s sole interest in intervening in Church affairs was “to extend [that power], to exalt it, because he understood the high mission that it had to fulfill in the world, and because he recognized in particular that it alone could bring together and confound the diverse peoples submitted to his empire, and to determine these people to live under a regular government.” For their part, the clergy gladly submitted to Charlemagne’s oversight, not

out of servility, but because they constituted “a corps which sensed the destinies held in store for it, and which united itself with enthusiasm and with love to the power which could give it that which it still lacked in order to fulfill them.”<sup>108</sup> Although one might contest any number of these historical characterizations, the implications of the lesson are clear. The Saint-Simonians call attention to a specific historical instance in which the centralized direction of both academic and spiritual life was necessary for the sake not only of advancing human understanding and preserving scriptural integrity, but also of establishing social solidarity, political stability, and the basic dignity of the moral educators themselves. This would be a lesson in public administration that Hippolyte Carnot would carry with him long after his ostensible estrangement from Saint-Simonianism.

### **Carnot’s Break with Enfantin and *La Revue Encyclopédique***

In November of 1831, Carnot joined his friends and colleagues Édouard Charton and Pierre Leroux among many others in noisily withdrawing from the Saint-Simonian movement of which Enfantin had recently declared himself the “pope.” Numerous sources characterize Carnot’s departure at this juncture as essentially the result of his having come to his senses. “When Enfantin transformed the doctrine of the master into a religion,” reads one biographical dictionary, “[Carnot] left the sect.”<sup>109</sup> “He took back his liberty,” writes his grandson, “when, under the influence of Enfantin, the Saint-Simonian School deviated towards a sort of ‘neo-Christianity,’ with its great priests, its ridiculous rituals.”<sup>110</sup> Although Robert Carlisle takes great pains to demonstrate that by adopting the organization and language of a religion, the Saint-Simonians were in fact returning to, rather than deviating from, the fundamental teachings of Saint-Simon,<sup>111</sup> even Carlisle

describes Carnot as “a good example of those who drank from the Saint-Simonian spring without drowning in it.”<sup>112</sup> All such evaluations serve to insert a safe distance, as it were, between the respected public figure of Hippolyte Carnot and what might be perceived as the more bizarre elements of Saint-Simonianism; to isolate Carnot’s involvement with the movement as an admittedly noteworthy but ultimately merely transient phase.

An assessment of the extent to which Saint-Simonianism retained an influence on Hippolyte Carnot throughout his life should begin with a more thorough appreciation of the causes of his departure. Carnot and his fellow schismatics did not object to the religious component of Saint-Simonianism. Saint-Simonianism had, after all, organized itself as a religion since the end of 1829. Philippe Buchez was among the more notable objectors who had left the school-turned-church at that juncture. Carnot was not. What changed at the end of 1831 was that the number of “supreme fathers” had decreased from two to one. Enfantin had encountered an irreconcilable disagreement with Bazard and, with the help of Olinde Rodrigues, had ousted his former partner and asserted a now undivided authority over the bulk of the movement. Most of those who left the Saint-Simonian flock in November of 1831 were those who had sided with Bazard against Enfantin.

Considering the nature of Bazard and Enfantin’s disagreement, Carnot’s withdrawal from the Saint-Simonian movement in November of 1831 may be interpreted as motivated by some of the same basic concerns that drew him to Saint-Simonianism to begin with. The dramatic dispute between the two supreme fathers had pertained to gender relations and the institution of marriage. By the summer of 1831, Enfantin had formulated a vision of what the married couple of the projected future society would look



like. He expected that divorce would become a more common and accepted practice, as it was impossible to predict how the relationship between a man and a woman might change over time. He imagined that the priesthood of the future would provide a sort of marriage counseling service: troubled couples would confide all the intimate details of their relationship in a member of the religious hierarchy, who would encourage and effect divorces and second marriages when appropriate. As controversial as these proposals/forecasts were at the time, for the most part Bazard ultimately found himself in agreement with Enfantin on these matters. Where Bazard could not go along, however, was with respect to Enfantin's attitudes toward female sexuality and paternity. While Enfantin firmly adhered to the position that men and women were of distinct and complementary natures—men being more active and assertive, women being more passive and sympathetic—he insisted that men and women ought to be equal partners in marriage and that the woman's sexual satisfaction was of equal consequence. Married women ought therefore to share in the same liberties traditionally afforded to married men. In response to the objection that such liberation would inevitably raise questions as to the paternity of a woman's children, Enfantin asserted that in the future, such questions would be of little concern. In a Saint-Simonian society, he explained, no one would stand to inherit any economic, social or political advantages as a result of his or her paternity. What need, then, would there be for a father to know his biological children or for a child to know his or her biological father?<sup>113</sup> When one appreciates the extent to which Carnot's attachment to Saint-Simonianism was connected to his relationship with his father and brother, it is hardly surprising that he would join with Bazard in breaking with Enfantin at this particular moment. Paul Carnot suggests such an interpretation when he

writes that Enfantin had advocated “an intersexual liberty which Hippolyte Carnot—the man of familial obligation—could not accept: he protested against the ‘legitimation of adultery’ and withdrew.”<sup>114</sup>

In acknowledging, to some degree, the extent to which Carnot retained an attachment to Saint-Simonianism, most scholars inevitably make reference to “On Saint-Simonianism,” a lecture he made to the Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences shortly before his death. A handful of libraries around the world possess uncirculating transcripts of this lecture, the only part of which regularly cited in the secondary literature is Carnot’s conclusion: “Serious spirits,” he claims, “will forget the chimera of the sacerdotal couple, dictator and confessor. But they will remember that the belief in the perfectibility of the individual and of society, and in the sentiment of human solidarity, was never professed and practiced with a more sincere ardor than in the Saint-Simonian school.”<sup>115</sup> Paul Carnot is unusual in quoting both sentences. Most sources only report the latter sentence, and in such a way as to suggest the nostalgia of an old man for a very distant moment in his youth.

But the mark of Saint-Simonianism is also clearly evident at many points during Carnot’s intervening life and career. It is obvious, for instance, in the brief notice placed by Carnot in *La Revue Encyclopédique* on the occasion of his and Pierre Leroux’s taking over editorship of the journal in September 1831, just as they were growing alienated from Enfantin. There, Carnot asserts that scientists had previously devoted themselves exclusively to “works of analysis, laboriously amassing the materials of the scientific edifice in the absence of an architectural plan destined to give them its form.”<sup>116</sup> As synthesizers and publicists, the new editors of *La Revue Encyclopédique* would attempt

to provide such a plan while also devoting attention to the fine arts, bearing in mind that, “the objective is the material and moral perfection of men.”<sup>117</sup>

The 60th volume of the *Revue*, published in mid 1834, included a lengthy preface in which the editors were able to articulate their beliefs and objectives more fully. This preface demonstrates the ways in which Carnot, Leroux, and their colleagues maintained and amended the teachings of Saint-Simonianism at this particular juncture. Clearly the editors retained a great deal. They manifest an ongoing concern for overarching synthesis and theoretical consistency in the practice of the sciences, as well as for unity and consensus in society at large.<sup>118</sup> In both cases these preoccupations amount to an insistence upon the need for centralized direction. “The moral life of the immense majority of the people is not self determined,” they write. “Occupied continually by the concern for its own subsistence, it receives the light of morality from above, as we receive the physical light of the sky which is over our heads.”<sup>119</sup> \*\*<sup>120</sup> The editors explicitly reject the increasingly influential doctrine of “art for art’s sake” and maintain, in fine Saint-Simonian fashion, that art essentially serves a social and political function.<sup>121</sup>

The editors of *La Revue Encyclopédique* certainly did not reject the spiritual dimension of Saint-Simonianism. They imagined that the *Revue* addressed a relative narrow audience comprised of “those men who also feel themselves drawn [as we do] towards the future, and are religiously occupied with it.”<sup>122</sup> The editors insist both

---

\*\* This would seem to be a direct reference to a famous exchange that took place in 1826 between Saint-Amand Bazard, speaking on behalf of the nascent Saint-Simonian school, and the prominent liberal thinker Benjamin Constant, in which Constant attempted to repudiate any form of centralized direction by comparing it to floods, hail, snow, lightning and all other evils that fall from above upon the unfortunate heads of those below. “Ah! Monsieur Constant,” responded Bazard, “you forgot to mention only one thing.—the light!”

implicitly and explicitly at several points in the Preface that any coherent political order must also be a religious order.<sup>123</sup> In a passage that could be taken directly out of the second year of the exposition of *The Doctrine*, the editors declare:

We firmly believe that insofar as diverse and contradictory tendencies divide spirits, it will be impossible, in establishing a social order, to edify anything endowed with harmony and unity. This is why we aspire, with all our energy, to show to the new generations the necessity for them to replace the Christian tradition, so incomplete, so false on so many points, with a tradition that is much vaster, and more truly universal.<sup>124</sup>

The point on which the editors of *La Revue Encyclopédique* claim to disagree most fundamentally with the Saint-Simonian School (“a school to which we at one time belonged”<sup>125</sup>) relates to their respective philosophies of history. Like the Saint-Simonians, the editors maintain a teleological conception of history. “[The history of] humanity is not a broken chain of fragmentary links,” they insist. “It is much rather a continuous succession of forces transmitted in order to produce an effect.”<sup>126</sup> Moreover, they agree with the Saint-Simonians, in making a reference to Pierre-Simon Ballanche, that “Our century, as people say everywhere, is a century of renovation and of palingenesis.”<sup>127</sup> Their principal disagreement and innovation pertains to the precise nature of this renovation and palingenesis. The editors explicitly reject the division of history into “critical” and “organic” epochs. It was this “false system” of historical classification, they argue, that led the Saint-Simonian school, among others, into “the most singular errors.” The worst of these errors, according to the editors, was the idealization of the Catholic society of the Middle Ages, which they describe as “the tracks of humanity, a step left behind it... that which needed to be left to rest in its tomb.”<sup>128</sup> In contrast to their opponents, the editors of the *Revue* consider themselves “partisans of modernity against antiquity, of the modern era against the middle ages.”

This modern era, they claim, is essentially the product of the 18th century, the fundamental intellectual legacy of which they defend as being “neither rationalism, nor incredulity, but **faith in progress.**”<sup>129</sup> Thus, in a sense, while the 18th century was “critical” in some respects, it possessed a significant “organic” element for the editors of the *Revue* to latch onto. It is from the modern tradition of the 18th century rather than that of the middle ages, the editors insist, that social and political reformers ought to draw their inspiration. “If, on the political landscape, we are republicans,” they explain,

it is because on the philosophical landscape we feel ourselves to be sons of the 18th Century and animated by its regenerative spirit, and because consequently for us the republic does not have the petty proportions of an improvisation of a club or a sterile plagiarism of the past.... Didn't the 18th Century itself have four centuries of Protestantism before it which pushed it forward and which continue to push us? How then to imagine that this march, ever growing and ever more universal, will all of a sudden stop? Far from believing in retrogression towards the monarchy, doesn't one see, in contemplating the past, the evident and natural course of things and the continuous march of Europe gravitating toward the republic?<sup>130</sup>

By tweaking, as it were, the Saint-Simonian philosophy of history, the editors of *La Revue Encyclopédique* were able to incorporate a clear and practical political orientation which the Saint-Simonian school and church had lacked.

Thus, by dispensing with the rigid distinction between critical and organic epochs (which, after all, hadn't assumed central importance within the Saint-Simonian school until shortly before the Exposition of The Doctrine) while retaining most of the other essentials of Saint-Simonianism, (e.g. the pursuit of social harmony and of political, intellectual and spiritual consensus, the achievement of which was understood to depend upon the leadership of an enlightened coterie capable of appreciating the underlying logic of human history) the editors of *La Revue Encyclopédique* performed a sort of intellectual sleight of hand. Through this sleight of hand, they were able to formulate what might be

described as the “Saint-Simonian republicanism,” which would prove the overriding theme of Hippolyte Carnot’s subsequent political career.

### **Carnot as Politician**

As a member of the Chamber of Deputies in the 1840s, Carnot ostensibly aligned himself with the left wing of the republican party, but he was the subject of repeated attacks by the leftist press for his conspicuous willingness to compromise with the moderate opposition.<sup>131</sup> Carnot expressed this characteristic aversion to partisan politics and persistent desire for consensus in several articles published in *La Revue Indépendante* as well as in a popular political brochure<sup>132</sup>, As for what might be understood as the enduring influence of Saint-Simonianism, Carnot offered much more significant evidence during his tenure as Minister of Public Instruction and of Religious Worship during the first four months of the Second Republic. Carnot’s short occupancy of this office proved extremely controversial; he was forced to resign before a vote of censure by the National Assembly and most of his ambitious proposals for the overhaul of the French educational system were either not enacted or immediately repealed following his departure. Yet, as his grandson would write on the centenary of the 1848 Revolution, “The reforms of Hippolyte Carnot had been straightaway so complete, so methodical, so well conceived... that they could almost be realized in full”<sup>133</sup> some thirty years later under the Third Republic, when Carnot was a revered elder statesman serving as a permanent member of the Senate. Carnot’s tenure as Minister of Public Instruction was thus an episode of considerable importance in the history of French public life, and one of which Carnot was thoughtful enough to provide a personal account, published in the form of a lengthy

brochure in the wake of his resignation. Carnot's ministry essentially bears witness to an attempt to put a Saint-Simonian republican program of public education into practice.

Carnot begins his account by describing the precise circumstances under which he came to be among the first ministers of the budding Second Republic. In this description, Carnot's concern for order in public discourse and a well-defined hierarchy in government administration come to the fore. The meetings of the provisional government which took place in late February were made especially difficult as a result of frequent intrusions by great crowds of non-members who, excited by the revolution, were interested in observing the proceedings. Carnot recounts how

We had barely taken possession of a table when an animated flood invaded the chamber and came to mix in with the deliberations after putting sabers and bayonets down on the green carpet. We withdrew from chamber to chamber, and everywhere similar scenes reproduced themselves.<sup>134</sup>

Abhorring the intrusion of such chaos, Carnot instead prized concord among a relatively small circle of influential people. He describes how, among the newcomers brought into the provisional government were Ferdinand Flocon and Alexandre Ledru-Rollin, respectively the editor and patron of *La Reforme*, a newspaper which had harshly criticized Carnot in the past. In the wake of the February revolution, however, the three men happily put the past behind them. Carnot recalls how, "Flocon, whom I barely knew personally, came to me and embraced me with cordiality. I broke a piece of bread with Ledru-Rollin: this was our republican supper after this rude journey."<sup>135</sup> Carnot attempted to reproduce such elite cordiality as he staffed his ministry, inviting two like-minded and distinguished *anciens saint-simoniens*, Édouard Charton and Jean Reynaud, to join him in sharing the highest responsibilities. Carnot conveyed upon the former the title of

Secretary General, upon the latter that of Under-Secretary of State. Of Charton in particular, Carnot writes, “he possessed the art of rendering everyone satisfied, even those whose demands could not be accommodated.”<sup>136</sup> In drafting a proposed law for the reform of French primary education, Carnot also enlisted the help of a “High Commission of Studies” to which he appointed a distinguished group of “the most notable and progressive men in the sciences, letters, government administration and above all education.”<sup>137</sup>

The single highest principle directing Carnot’s efforts as Minister of Public Instruction was the belief that a republic required a republican form of education. He quotes Aristotle as giving voice to the maxim that “It is necessary, in an oligarchy, for education to be oligarchic, monarchic in a monarchy, democratic in a democracy: without this condition there will be no stability.”<sup>138</sup> For Carnot, a republican educational system would necessarily possess a number of essential characteristics. First, a republican education must be a means by which the most gifted members of every social class may serve the greater good by cultivating their own valuable talents. In the realms of secondary and higher education, therefore, the state should be active and generous in awarding scholarships to all students who distinguish themselves in primary school.<sup>139</sup> Carnot views free and mandatory primary education as nothing less than “the reciprocal obligation of society to the citizen, and of the citizen toward society.”<sup>140</sup> A proper republican primary school serves as the venue at which citizens learn to defend their civil rights and fulfill their civic responsibilities. In explaining the mission of the public education system, Carnot declared, “We form new citizens for the new institutions.”<sup>141</sup> Pursuant to this mission, the ministry commissioned the composition of “Manuals of



Civic Education” to be distributed to instructors around the country, which, while intended to vary somewhat from locality to locality, would largely ensure that the proper lessons were being universally conveyed.<sup>142</sup> Carnot was not content that the vitally important work of the ministry should be confined within schoolhouse walls; he rather sought ways of intervening in France’s wider public culture. At the suggestion of the High Commission, Carnot attempted to organize a “Festival of Childhood” in which all the students at all the primary schools of Paris would be assembled for a magnificent public ceremony in which the most distinguished among them would be awarded full scholarships to the most elite secondary institutions. “Such a celebration,” writes the disappointed Carnot, “would have had an original and touching character; it would not at all have fallen short of those of the *Arc-de-l’Étoile* and of the *École Militaire*.”<sup>143</sup> Going beyond public education in the academic institutional sense, Carnot also opened a competition for the writing of national songs for use in public functions.<sup>144</sup>

Carnot served not only as Minister of Public Instruction, but also as Minister of Religious Worship. The conjunction of the two positions was an innovation of the provisional government. Previously, the ministry of religious worship had been attached to the ministry of justice, as Carnot puts it, “without any logical reason.”<sup>145</sup> There would of course be a very obvious logical reason for such an association were one to regard religious worship as principally the exercise of a legally-recognized individual right. From Carnot’s perspective, however, the conjunction of religious worship with public instruction was far more appropriate. In this second bailiwick, Carnot attempted to reconcile the clergy with the cause of the revolution. He reminds his readers that during the Revolution of 1789, the First Estate had been noble enough to join with the Third

Estate in composing the National Assembly. His fervent desire for cordiality with the Church notwithstanding, however, Carnot delivered a circular to the bishops of France firmly demanding that they obey a decree made by the provisional government stipulating that the words “*Domine salvam fac Rempubicam*” be inserted into the liturgy of the mass (in place of the words “*Domine salvam fac Regem*”). Carnot hoped that by doing so, and by otherwise expressing their support for the republic, the clergy would “bring to the new order a more genuine sympathy,”<sup>146</sup> which the tone of Carnot’s circular would suggest they had not been doing. He admonished the bishops, “above all, not to allow the priests of your diocese to forget that, citizens by the participation in the exercise of all the political rights, they are children of the great French family.” Carnot suggested that “the clergy will find a more solid and durable protection in the conformity of their sentiments with those of the people,”<sup>147</sup> a statement that some of his readers might have found implicitly threatening.

Carnot made use of the brochure to defend himself against the accusations of his critics. The single greatest scandal faced by Carnot’s ministry related to one of its commissioned Manuals of Civic Education in which the author, the young philosopher Charles Renouvier, posed the speculative question, “whether the republican regime should not add something to the rights of the woman in the family; if, in the interest of marriage itself, it is not good that divorce should be reestablished as during the time of the Emperor.”<sup>148</sup> Much of the vehement political outcry relating to this passage was the result of a basic misunderstanding: the Manuals of Civic Education had been intended for circulation among primary school **instructors**, not primary school students, for whom the topic of divorce was deemed grossly inappropriate. Another element of the controversy,

however, surrounded reports that Carnot had forced the rector of one academy to retire as punishment for refusing to disseminate the controversial manual. Carnot explains in the brochure that only one rector had retired following the publication of the manuals, and for completely unrelated reasons.<sup>149</sup> As for the more general criticism of his ministry as having been heavy-handed in his relations with the Church, Carnot responds that he never threatened to suppress the salary of a recalcitrant clergyman, “an undignified tactic, in my opinion, for a government possessing moral force.”<sup>150</sup>

While Carnot clearly sought to impart a unified and centralized direction to French academic and religious life, he was more than willing to tolerate a diversity of opinion within certain appropriate circles and parameters. With respect to primary and even secondary education, Carnot claims,

It seemed to me terribly anarchical to authorize side-by-side with the standard teaching another teaching which would perhaps be the refutation of the first.... [However,] higher education comports this liberty, because it addresses itself to men already formed and capable of choosing between error and truth.<sup>151</sup>

Within the realm of higher education, in fact, Carnot declares “the protection of free thinkers” to be a principle comparable in importance to that of free and mandatory primary education.<sup>152</sup> Closely related to this principle, Carnot says of “the freedom of teaching: I have always regarded it as inseparably linked to the constitution of a national education.”<sup>153</sup> What exactly Carnot means by “the freedom of teaching” is not made terribly clear in the brochure. Paul Carnot, however, is gracious enough to explain that his grandfather denoted by this term, “the right of every citizen to communicate to others that which he knows... it will suffice that the future master demonstrates, before an equitable jury, the proof of his aptitude to teach.”<sup>154</sup> While preferably limited according

to the qualifications of the teacher and the maturity of the students present, Carnot nonetheless maintains a place in the classroom for freedom of expression and exposure.

Finally, one of Carnot's most conspicuous and persistent concerns relates to the material and social condition of teachers. In recognition of teachers' great importance, Carnot insisted that all those accepted to the *École Normale Supérieure* should be granted full scholarships, as was already the established practice at the *École Polytechnique*. Such a disparity between the two institutions was even more galling, according to Carnot, by virtue of the woeful fact that "few rich or even comfortable families destine their children to the career of education, a career as penurious as it is honorable, hardly lucrative and demanding great devotion."<sup>155</sup> Outraged by how little primary school instructors were paid, Carnot hoped, as minister, to be able to raise the salaries of all French teachers to at least 600 francs per year.<sup>156</sup> As he made clear in a circular issued only three days following his installation, however, "It is not only important to elevate [teachers'] condition by a just augmentation of their appointments; it is necessary that the dignity of their function be raised in all manners." In order to afford appropriate recognition to exemplary teachers, Carnot suggests that an honorary hierarchy be established among teachers much like the one enjoyed by members of the military. "Their prospects for advancement should not be inferior to those of soldiers," he declares. "Their merit also deserves decoration."<sup>157</sup> Significantly, Carnot compares teachers to soldiers on a separate occasion as part of an exhortation to teachers themselves. "I call on them to make their contribution to the founding of the republic," he writes, "It is not necessary, as in the time of our fathers, to defend the republic against dangers from abroad, it is necessary to defend it against lies and ignorance, and this task appertains to

them.”<sup>158</sup> For this later generation of revolutionaries, Carnot suggests, the calling of the educator (which, as Minister of Public Instruction, he himself is answering) is equally if not more honorable than the calling of the soldier. His reference to “our fathers” immediately reminds the reader of Carnot’s perpetual underlying concerns and motivations. Lest such a reference be too subtle, Carnot is far more explicit at the end of his brochure, at which point he concludes:

In truth, as I look over the pages I have just written, I am proud in my belief that these four months of my life were well employed, that I loyally and substantially served my country, and that one day I will have the right to say to my father that I honorably transmitted his name to my children.<sup>159</sup>

In sum, Carnot’s account of his own agenda as Minister of Public Instruction suggests not only a continuity in terms of motivation from his earlier years but also a significant continuity in terms of philosophical and social outlook. In his convening of a “High Commission of Studies,” in his distribution of Manuals of Civic Instruction, and in his broad attempts to make use of academic and religious institutions in the hopes of consolidating popular support for the new regime, Carnot seems to have modeled his ministry remarkably closely on the administration of Charlemagne as described in the second year of the exposition of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon*. Unlike Charlemagne, however, the “civilizing mission” appreciated by Carnot as minister was not that of the Catholic clergyman (although he had a part to play as well), but rather that of the republican public schoolteacher. For Carnot, the public schoolteacher—paid, certified, and gently directed by a central government commission—fell virtually seamlessly into the role of the Saint-Simonian artist/priest.

### **After 1848: The *Mémoires***

Having been one of only three elected representatives refusing to swear the oath of loyalty to Napoleon III, Carnot's political career was put on hiatus until 1863, during which time he was able to devote himself to, among other endeavors, finally completing the biography of his father that he had begun decades earlier. Carnot's introduction to the *Mémoires sur Carnot par son Fils*, written in 1860 and addressed directly to his own two sons, Sadi and Adolphe, (to whom the *Mémoires* is dedicated) is a stunningly intimate epistle and especially revealing of the ways in which Carnot maintained and adapted the doctrines of Saint-Simonianism over the course of his life. Many of the paternal counsels Carnot imparts to his sons in the introduction appear to follow easily recognizable Saint-Simonian themes. For example, Carnot expresses his hopes that in reading the *Memoirs*, "You also, dear children, you will be initiated by the love of the family into that of the fatherland, which inspired [your grandfather] so happily,"<sup>160</sup> a suggestion immediately reminiscent of the process by which national sentiment is cultivated in the "Memoirs of an Industrial of the Year 2240." While he is enormously pleased that both his sons have decided to attend the *École Polytechnique* and to serve their country in the same scientific capacity as their grandfather, Carnot is quick to remind them of the importance of their other faculties, admonishing them, "[not to] forget that the savant should avoid being entirely absorbed, that he should, under pain of remaining impotent even in science, join to his rigorous cult that of the arts and of letters."<sup>161</sup> Far from disavowing his own youthful idealism, Carnot recalls that his father

willfully devoted his thought to the utopias of progress. Do not reject, my children, these beautiful visions, disdained by our too young sages; abandon your souls to them, at the risk of being called dreamers. Not only do they exercise the best of our sentiments, the love of our peers, but they

are the best path to the truth. The most positive sciences proceed from utopia.<sup>162</sup>

Carnot's most striking innovation with respect to Saint-Simonian conventions pertains to his particular use of the concept of "living law." The second year of the exposition of *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon* had concluded with an articulation of this concept,<sup>163</sup> which was subsequently the subject of numerous writings and sermons to the Saint-Simonian faithful. The Saint-Simonians, and Enfantin in particular, maintained that investing authority in written laws would inevitably prove both less effective and less humane than investing authority in especially charismatic individuals who would then personify the law and make it "live." In the introduction to the *Mémoires*, after summarizing his father's role in the French revolution, Carnot engages in a fascinating discussion of France's particular national character, addressing the common perception (at the time) that the French were a uniquely monarchical people who would always revert to some form of absolutist government. With the demise of the Second Republic a very recent memory, such an assessment was an obviously timely subject for critical consideration. "The Frenchman is less Monarchist than one would think," Carnot concludes,

but he obeys bosses more willingly than books, he obeys the living law more readily than the written law: he does not look for his rule in a legislative bible: this is his Catholic side. The rule needs to personify itself before him and to take on a costume in order to be recognized. The Frenchman is endowed with an impatience for movements that render the yoke of the law punishing: since that is the irritant, he makes an effort to escape it; he does not wait for it to be reformed, he breaks it.<sup>164</sup>

What was once a prescription for the Saint-Simonians has, under the Second Empire, become a concession for Carnot; it is a lamentable but obvious fact that written laws do not (at least among the French) command the same respect as charismatic authority.

Unless this popular disposition is confronted, no democratic form of government can possibly take hold. Carnot maintains, just as he did in 1848, that any attempted fundamental reform of laws or institutions will inevitably prove ineffectual without a concurrent reform of human beings. Towards this end, unsurprisingly, he insists that an aggressive program of national education is essential. In a truly democratic society, the educational system will be “an institution which will serve as the basis of all the others.”<sup>165</sup> Most provocatively, Carnot declares that “**National education will be the living law of the future.**”<sup>166</sup> He thus reveals to his two sons (and to whoever else happened to be reading) that the educational system to which he attributes the fundamental cohesion of any future democratic society essentially embodies the same miraculously uniting force previously ascribed by the Saint-Simonians to some combination of male and female messiahs.

### **Epilogue: President Carnot and the Saint-Simonian Republic**

Hippolyte Carnot’s influence on his eldest son, in particular, proved to be among his more consequential legacies. After graduating from the *École Polytechnique* in 1860, Marie-François-Sadi Carnot trained at the National School of Bridges and Roadways before going to work as a civil engineer in the rugged and newly annexed *département* of Haute Savoie. Immediately following the proclamation of the Third Republic, Sadi Carnot entered politics and was elected to the National Assembly in 1871. Between 1878 and 1881, he served first as Under-Secretary of State and then as Minister of Public Works. In this capacity, he oversaw the initial implementation of the Freycinet Plan,<sup>167</sup> under which ultimately over nine billion francs would be invested by the state in the construction of new highways, railroads, canals, and port facilities.<sup>168</sup> In 1882, he was



elected president of the *Union Démocratique*, the moderate wing of the republican delegation in the Chamber of Deputies.<sup>169</sup> Finally, in December of 1887, three months before his death, Hippolyte Carnot had the extraordinary privilege, as the oldest sitting member of the Senate, of attending the session of the National Assembly at which his son was elected President of the Republic<sup>170</sup> by a 77% majority. Sadi Carnot declared, in fine Saint-Simonian form, that he considered his election “high testimony to the desire for pacification and concord by which France was animated.”<sup>171</sup>

Sadi Carnot’s tenure as president took place at a pivotal moment in French history. The administration of his immediate predecessor, Jules Grévy, had collapsed in the face of a corruption scandal and public confidence in the republican regime was at a low point. At the same time, President Carnot had to contend with the rising political star of General Georges Ernest Boulanger, whose radical authoritarian movement, variously characterized by some historians as fundamentally left-wing and by others as fundamentally right-wing, has been more consistently described as one of the most significant and direct precursors of 20th century fascism.<sup>172</sup> The same month Carnot took office, General Boulanger made a secret pact with royalist leaders—a pact subsequently revised and renewed the following March—to gain control of the Chamber of Deputies, overthrow the republic and (so the royalists were convinced) restore the monarchy.<sup>173</sup> As the Boulangist coalition steadily gathered momentum over the course of 1888, the situation of the Third Republic began to look grim. In September, Jules Ferry, the former Minister of Public Instruction, wrote to one of his republican colleagues, “Mr. Carnot, whom France acclaims as much as she can, holds our destinies in his hands.” In confronting the threat posed by Boulangism, President Carnot manifested a keen

authoritative resolve. He surrounded himself with journalists and financiers and coordinated a massive republican media campaign.<sup>174</sup> He also began traveling extensively throughout the *départements* in order to drum up support and to present the face of the republic to communities too often ignored by Paris. Even after the Boulangist threat was effectively diffused following the elections of 1889,<sup>175</sup> President Carnot maintained an active travel schedule, often to great political effect.<sup>176</sup> On a visit to Reims in 1891, for instance, the president received a most illustrative panegyric from an especially eloquent laborer. “We are happy for ourselves,” the laborer said,

Knowing the particular concern you bear for the laborer, for his work, and for his burdens. We appreciate that this concern originates from your own experience, from this high science of the engineer which has bestowed upon our country such magnificent works. We salute you, Mr. President, the First Worker of France.<sup>177</sup>

It was during his first visit to Savoy in 1888, however, that the president received a more succinct and perhaps even more fittingly Saint-Simonian honorific from the elated mayor of Annecy, the very town in which Carnot had lived and worked in the 1860s. Making a complementary parallel to the president’s celebrated grandfather, the mayor declared Sadi Carnot, “The Organizer of Peace.”<sup>178</sup> Tragically, President Carnot would die shortly after being stabbed by an Italian anarchist while on a visit to Lyon in June of 1894.

In his deft handling of the Boulanger Affair and in his approach to governance in general, Sadi Carnot very arguably demonstrated a Saint-Simonian awareness of the mechanics of popular sentiment and the importance of asserting a moral authority based on charisma and sympathy rather than shows of coercive force. One of the president’s more recent biographers, Patrick Harismendy, makes an even bolder claim, identifying “The project of a Saint-Simonian republic that reveals itself across all of Sadi’s

commitments and declarations.”<sup>179</sup> In pursuing this project, inherited from his father, Sadi Carnot made a crucially important contribution to establishing France as one of the world’s principal bastions of liberal democracy.

## **Conclusion**

In attempting to distill the essence and historical significance of any system of ideas, an exclusively textual analysis can only go so far. The main thrust(s) of an ideology cannot be fully discerned or extricated from the manner in which it is received, internalized, and carried forward by its adherents. In this sense, and like many “isms” throughout history, there were as many Saint-Simonianisms as there were Saint-Simonians. Hippolyte Carnot was not alone, however, in maintaining a consistent attachment to a particular variant of Saint-Simonianism thoroughly in harmony with the republican tradition he inherited from his father. Fundamental to this Saint-Simonian republicanism, among other things, was the firm belief in the importance of a vigorous, multifaceted and centrally directed program of moral/civic education in maintaining the cohesion of any body politic, especially a democratic one. As Carnot, his associates, and their descendants elaborated and pursued this political program, Saint-Simonian republicanism demonstrated itself to be, if anything, significantly less utopian than the strictly liberal variety.

## **Notes**

---

<sup>1</sup> Bellanger, II, 94-99 and Nobécourt, 68-70, 103-116.

<sup>2</sup> *Dictionnaire Universel des Littératures*, ed. Gustave Vapereau (Paris: Hachette, 1876), s.v. “Guérault” and Patrick Harismendy, *Sadi Carnot: L’ingénieur de la République* (Paris: Perrin, 1995), 414.

<sup>3</sup> *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, s.v. “Leroux (Pierre)” and Viard.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Marie-Laure Aurenche, *Édouard Charton et L'Invention du Magasin Pittoresque (1833-1870)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002) and Annie Lagarde-Fouquet and Christian Lagarde, *Édouard Charton (1807-1890) et le Combat Contre l'Ignorance* (Rennes : Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2006).

<sup>5</sup> Charléty, 43-46.

<sup>6</sup> Carlisle, 66-67.

<sup>7</sup> Reddy, 1548 f. 8 and Carlisle, 47, 157.

<sup>8</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires sur Carnot par son Fils*, 2nd. ed. (Paris: Charavay Mantoux, Martin, 1893), I, 6.

<sup>9</sup> Marcel Reinhard, *Le Grand Carnot* (Paris: Hachette, 1950-1952).

<sup>10</sup> *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, 2nd. ed., ed. Paula K. Byers (Gale Research, 1998), s.v. "Carnot, Lazare-Nicolas-Marguerite."

<sup>11</sup> Paul Carnot, *Hippolyte Carnot et le Ministère de L'Instruction Publique de la IIe République (24 février-5 juillet 1848)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948), 6.

<sup>12</sup> cited in Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, I, 51.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>14</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, "The Life of N.-L.-Sadi Carnot" in *Reflections on the Motive Power of Heat*, ed. R. H. Thurston (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1897), 32-33.

<sup>15</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, II, 617-619.

<sup>16</sup> *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, s.v. "Carnot, Nicolas-Léonard-Sadi."

<sup>17</sup> Paul Carnot, 16.

<sup>18</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, "The Life of N.-L.-Sadi Carnot," 21.

<sup>19</sup> *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, s.v. "Carnot, Nicolas-Léonard-Sadi."

<sup>20</sup> Paul Carnot, 16.

<sup>21</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, "The Life of N.-L.-Sadi Carnot," 35.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>24</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. "Carnot-Feulins, Claude-Marie."

<sup>25</sup> see, for instance, the discussion of Lazare's decision to support the declaration of war in 1792 in Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, I, 215-216.

<sup>26</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. "Carnot, Joseph-François-Claude."

<sup>27</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, II, 284.

- 
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid., II, 605.
- <sup>29</sup> Paul Carnot, 17.
- <sup>30</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, "The Life of N.-L.-Sadi Carnot," 30.
- <sup>31</sup> Paul Carnot, 22-23.
- <sup>32</sup> Harismendy, 55.
- <sup>33</sup> Hippolyte Carnot and Hippolyte Auger eds., "Prospectus," *Le Gymnase: Recueil de Moral et de Littérature* 1 (1828): 5 <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1127085.image.r=Le+Gymnase.f7.langEN>>.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid., 6.
- <sup>35</sup> "Discussions Philosophiques," *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 5-16.
- <sup>36</sup> "Discussions Philosophiques," *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 99-108.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., 103.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid., 102.
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid., 104.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid., 102.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., 105.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., 107.
- <sup>43</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, II, 282.
- <sup>44</sup> "Les Académies," *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 215.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid., 217.
- <sup>46</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, II, 279.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid., 281.
- <sup>48</sup> "Les Académies," *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 220.
- <sup>49</sup> "Les Académies," *Le Gymnase* 4 (1828): 22-32, 23.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., 24-25.
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid., 26.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid., 31-32.
- <sup>53</sup> "Les Académies," *Le Gymnase* 4 (1828): 118-119.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid., 120.

- 
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid., 125.
- <sup>56</sup> “*Établissement et Direction des Écoles Primaires Gratuites D’Adultes*,” *Le Gymnase* 2 (1828): 264.
- <sup>57</sup> “*Un Moraliste au Cours de M. Cousin*,” *Le Gymnase* 1(1828): 258-269, 266.
- <sup>58</sup> “*Sociétés Philanthropiques*,” *Le Gymnase* 1 (1828): 80-91, 84.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., 85.
- <sup>60</sup> “*Société de la Morale Chrétienne: Séance du 14 Juillet*,” *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 122-129.
- <sup>61</sup> “*Théâtres: Un Mot sur la Crise Actuelle du Théâtre*,” *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 169-184.
- <sup>62</sup> “*Contre La Tendence Industrielle du Siècle*,” *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 237-238.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., 241.
- <sup>64</sup> “*Postscriptum du Directeur*,” *Le Gymnase* 4 (1828): 271.
- <sup>65</sup> Carlisle, 72.
- <sup>66</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, XVII, 149.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid., XVII, 151.
- <sup>68</sup> Ibid., XVII, 154.
- <sup>69</sup> Carlisle, 75-76.
- <sup>70</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, XVII, 149.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., XVII, 206-207.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid., XVII, 208.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid., XVII, 213.
- <sup>74</sup> Carlisle, 87-89.
- <sup>75</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, XXXVIII, 3-207.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid., XXV, 73-83.
- <sup>77</sup> See Manuel, 172-173 and Iggers, xv, 1n, 111n, 223n, 252 and Saint-Simon and Enfantin, II, 39-41
- <sup>78</sup> C. Bouglé, and Elie Halévy eds., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon: Exposition: Première Année, 1829* (Paris: Librairie des Sciences Politiques et Sociales Marcel Rivière, 1924), 320.
- <sup>79</sup> Iggers, 141.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid., 143.
- <sup>81</sup> Ibid., 147.

- 
- <sup>82</sup> Ibid., 151.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid., 109.
- <sup>84</sup> Ibid., 209, 232.
- <sup>85</sup> Ibid., 151.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid., 172-173.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid., 157.
- <sup>88</sup> Pickering, I, 231-244.
- <sup>89</sup> Ibid., 331.
- <sup>90</sup> Saint-Simon and Enfantin, I, 166.
- <sup>91</sup> Iggers, 233.
- <sup>92</sup> Ibid., 231.
- <sup>93</sup> Ibid., 155.
- <sup>94</sup> Ibid., 235-241.
- <sup>95</sup> Ibid., 202.
- <sup>96</sup> Hippolyte Carnot and Saint-Amand Bazard eds., *Doctrine de Saint Simon. Exposition. 2me Année. – 1829 -1830* (Paris: Bureau de L'Organisateur et de Globe, 1830), 15.
- <sup>97</sup> Iggers 157.
- <sup>98</sup> Ibid., 172-173.
- <sup>99</sup> Ibid., 198.
- <sup>100</sup> Carnot and Bazard, 143.
- <sup>101</sup> Ibid., 157.
- <sup>102</sup> Ibid., 114.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid., 125-126.
- <sup>104</sup> Ibid., 18.
- <sup>105</sup> Ibid., 58.
- <sup>106</sup> Ibid., 29-31.
- <sup>107</sup> Ibid., 49-50.
- <sup>108</sup> Ibid., 52.

- 
- <sup>109</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. “Carnot, Lazare-Hippolyte.”
- <sup>110</sup> Paul Carnot, 7.
- <sup>111</sup> Carlisle, 41.
- <sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.
- <sup>113</sup> Carlisle, 164-168.
- <sup>114</sup> Paul Carnot, 24.
- <sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.
- <sup>116</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Revue Encyclopédique: Avis* (Paris: Imprimerie d’Everat), 1  
<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k5517853j.r=La+Revue+Encyclopédique.langEN>>.
- <sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.
- <sup>118</sup> “*Préface*,” *La Revue Encyclopédique* 60 (Oct.-Dec., 1833): viii, x-xii.
- <sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, xxv-xxvi.
- <sup>120</sup> Saint-Simon and Infantin, I, 181-182.
- <sup>121</sup> “*Préface*,” xii, xix.
- <sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, vi.
- <sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, ix-x, xxiv, xxvi.
- <sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, xxv.
- <sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii.
- <sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, xii.
- <sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, xxx.
- <sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxviii.
- <sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, xii my emphasis.
- <sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, xvii-xviii.
- <sup>131</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Le Ministère de L’Instruction Publique et des Cultes, depuis le 24 Février jusqu’au 5 Juillet 1848* (Paris: Chez Pagnerre, 1848), 6.
- <sup>132</sup> see Hippolyte Carnot, “*L’Allemagne Pendant la Guerre de Délivrance*,” *La Revue Indépendante* 6 (1845): 374-405 and Hippolyte Carnot, *De L’Esclavage Colonial*, (Paris: Bureau de *La Revue Indépendante*, 1845) and Hippolyte Carnot, *Les Radicaux et La Charte* (Paris: Pagnerre, 1847) and *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. “Carnot, Lazare-Hippolyte.”
- <sup>133</sup> Paul Carnot, 6.



---

<sup>134</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Le Ministère de L'Instruction Publique et des Cultes*, 4.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>148</sup> cited in Paul Carnot, 73.

<sup>149</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Le Ministère de L'Instruction Publique et des Cultes*, 35-38.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 60-61.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>154</sup> Paul Carnot, 44.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>160</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, I, 7.

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 16-17.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>163</sup> Carnot and Bazard, 169-172.

<sup>164</sup> Hippolyte Carnot, *Mémoires*, I, 43-44.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 45 my emphasis.

<sup>167</sup> Harismendy, 225-256.

<sup>168</sup> Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976), 209-210.

<sup>169</sup> Harismendy, 264-277.

<sup>170</sup> Paul Carnot, 9.

<sup>171</sup> *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, s.v. “Carnot, Marie-François-Sadi.”

<sup>172</sup> William D. Irvine, *The Boulanger Affair Reconsidered: Royalism, Boulangism, and the Origins of the Radical Right in France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 3-20.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., 73-80.

<sup>174</sup> Harismendy, 332-335.

<sup>175</sup> see Irvine, 125-156.

<sup>176</sup> Harismendy, 346.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 352.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., 350.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 380.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION: EDUCATION, HEGEMONY AND SAINT-SIMONIANISM

In his famous work, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*, Eugen Weber describes the prominent role played by late 19th century schoolteachers in the broadening and entrenching of French national identity as well as the legitimation of the Third Republic. Prior to mid-century, Weber describes, to be a schoolteacher, and especially a rural schoolteacher, was generally a squalid and subaltern existence. He suggests that the character of the schoolteacher in Balzac's novel, *Les Paysans*, "who ended as a poacher, part-cordwainer, part beggar, and fulltime drunk, was evidently an acceptable stereotype under the July Monarchy."<sup>1</sup> After mid-century, however, the condition, role, and image of the schoolteacher began to change dramatically. Weber cites the 1865 report of a sub-prefect from the *département* of Yonne, warning the Imperial government of schoolteachers' growing influence.

"Teachers," it seemed,

were running the affairs of negligent, often illiterate mayors. They had become legal advisers to the villagers; lent farmers money, wrote their letters, and surveyed their fields; had 'become occult powers.' Their prestige was great, their status in the community almost 'sacerdotal.' Most alarming of all... teachers were even beginning to go into politics.

During the 1880s, schoolteachers enjoyed a further upswing in social prominence when, with the passage of the Jules Ferry Laws, they became, in effect, "the licensed representatives of the Republic."<sup>2</sup> Surveying the practice of education under the Third Republic, Weber concludes that "the schoolteachers, in their worn, dark suits, appear as the militia of the new age, harbingers of enlightenment and of the Republican message that reconciled the benighted masses with a new world, superior in wellbeing and

democracy.”<sup>3</sup> This militia, effectively assuming the form and function Hippolyte Carnot had envisioned in 1848, possessed a certain *esprit de corps* and sense of mission. As one French educator, Félix Pécaut, put it in 1879, “No one has ever found the secret of forging a *patrie* without common ideas.”<sup>4</sup> The crucial social function of the educator, as Pécaut understood it, was to inculcate those ideas.

Education represents something of a blind spot for Habermas. His attitude toward the extension of public education during the late 19th century (that is, in conjunction with the structural transformation of the public sphere) is not completely clear. On the one hand, he quotes H. P. Bahrdt in listing the provision of opportunities for continuing education as among the “functions originally fulfilled by institutions that were public not only in the legal but also in the sociological sense, [which] are taken over by organizations whose activity is non-public.”<sup>5</sup> Almost immediately afterward, however, Habermas bemoans how, as part of the structural transformation “the family increasingly lost also the functions of upbringing and education, protection, care, and guidance—indeed, of the transmission of elementary tradition and frameworks of orientation.”<sup>6</sup> Thus it is not clear whether Habermas regards education as originally a public concern which was transformed into a private concern, or as originally a private concern which was transformed into a public concern. With respect to the period preceding the structural transformation, Habermas never discusses the actual practice of education. For the most part, he simply refers to being educated as one of the essential preconditions for participation in the public sphere. Habermas makes what is perhaps his most noteworthy reference to education during his discussion of Hegel, who regarded public discourse as “another antidote to the self-conceit of individuals singly and en

masse, and another means—indeed one of the chief means—of their education.”<sup>7</sup> Hegel did not, however, regard free public discussion as a reliable means of ascertaining truth, nor did he imagine that the state had any obligation to obey the dictates of public opinion. Habermas concludes that “The public sphere thus demoted to a ‘means of education’ counted no longer as a principle of enlightenment and as a sphere in which reason realized itself.”<sup>8</sup> The implication would appear to be that a vigorous public sphere (like that of the late 18th and early 19th centuries) should not require the intervention of the state in the form of public education; reason should simply be able to realize itself. This might be considered as yet another respect in which Habermas’s liberal Enlightenment ideal of public discourse is “impossibly utopian.”

For Gramsci, by contrast, the practice of education does not represent a blind spot. Rather, it represents one of his principal areas of concern. In his *Prison Notebooks*, one of Gramsci’s most concise, polished, and carefully considered essays pertains to the contemporary controversy surrounding proper pedagogical method. In proposing a model of his own, Gramsci insists that “it is necessary to place limits on libertarian ideologies in this field and to stress with some energy the duty of the adult generations... to ‘mould’ the new generations.”<sup>9</sup> Gramsci argues that education must serve, in effect, “to insert [the student] into the State and into civil society” by instilling in him an awareness

that there exist social and state laws which are the product of human activity, which are established by men and can be altered by men in the interests of their collective development. These laws of the State and of society create that human order which historically best enables men to dominate the laws of nature, that is to say which most facilitates their **work**. For work is the specific mode by which man actively participates in natural life in order to transform and socialize it more and more deeply and extensively.... Human work cannot be realized in all its power of expansion and productivity without an exact and realistic knowledge of natural laws and without a legal order which organically regulates men’s

life in common. Men must respect this legal order through spontaneous assent, and not merely as an external imposition—it must be a necessity recognized and proposed to themselves as freedom, and not simply the result of coercion.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, in a passage which could be taken directly out of the *Doctrine of Saint-Simon*, Gramsci asserts that in order for men to cooperate in dominating nature, some form of hegemony must be in place, and that education is one of the principal means of establishing that hegemony.

Gramsci's interest in the practice of education is also very much apparent in his "Notes on Italian History," in which he is most concerned with understanding the social and political developments leading up to and immediately following Italian unification during the 19th century. One of the principal reasons why Italy had remained disunited for so long, Gramsci suggests, was that no social group had been able to effectively co-opt the "Intellectuals." None, therefore, had ever been able to exercise hegemony over the whole of Italian society. Gramsci argues that the Moderate Party, which played a leading role in the political orchestration of unification, was finally able to command the loyalty of Italian intellectuals largely by being the only movement at the time openly hostile to Jesuit domination of Italian education. By attacking the Jesuits' monopoly, he claims, the Moderates were able to extend new avenues for professional and social advancement to the much broader class of lay intellectuals. Gramsci goes on to suggest that

The hegemony of a directive center over the intellectuals asserts itself by two principal routes: 1. A general conception of life, a philosophy... which offers to its adherents an intellectual 'dignity'... 2. A scholastic programme, an educative principle and original pedagogy which interests that fraction of the intellectuals which is the most homogeneous and the most numerous (the teachers, from the primary teachers to the university professors), and gives them an activity of their own in the technical field.<sup>11</sup>

This, in effect, summarizes the contemporary appeal of Saint-Simonianism for those members of society whom Gramsci called “intellectuals” and whom the Saint-Simonians called “artists.” From the initial appearance of *Le Producteur*, Saint-Simonianism offered “artists” a dignified, leading role in society, a role that was eventually associated in *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon* with the practice of “moral education.” The “artists,” would essentially serve, like Gramsci’s “intellectuals,” as the functionaries of social hegemony. The precise form of government that would accompany this social hegemony was a matter of ancillary concern, and was largely left nebulous. The schematic understanding of Western history ultimately adopted by the Saint-Simonian movement, which maintained a rigorous distinction between the “organic” epoch of the Middle Ages and the “critical” epoch of the 18th century, strongly suggested that the government of the “organic” future would not be a republic. This, however, was a component of Saint-Simonianism that was easily bracketed and dispensed with by Hippolyte Carnot, Pierre Leroux and the staff of *La Revue Encyclopédique*, who essentially formulated what could be termed “Saint-Simonian republicanism.” Carnot effectively put this ideological formula into practice during his brief but influential tenure as Minister of Public Instruction and Religious Worship under the Second Republic. Central to the agenda of Saint-Simonian republicanism was the implementation of a concerted campaign of republican public education under which schoolteachers would largely assume the function previously ascribed by the Saint-Simonians initially to the “artist” and subsequently to the “priest.” Although Carnot left office after only four months, his vision of public schoolteachers serving as the functionaries of a republican hegemony would ultimately be largely realized.

What the Saint-Simonians impress upon us, then, is not so much the crazed vision of a totalitarian theocracy, but rather the awareness that public discourse—even, and perhaps especially, within a stable democracy—never fully realizes the classic liberal ideal of freedom and rationality. There always persists a significant extent to which public discourse resembles not so much a process by which “reason realizes itself,” but rather a process by which collective sentiment is carefully orchestrated. Behind this orchestration, moreover, lie orchestrators. Very often, the integrity of a political community can depend upon the capacities of this body of functionaries, as well as their willingness to accept certain responsibilities and constraints.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Weber, 305.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 318.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 303.

<sup>4</sup> Félix Pécaut, *Études au Jour le Jour sur l'Éducation Nationale* (1879), 26 cited in Weber, 111.

<sup>5</sup> Hans Paul Bahrtdt, *Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit als Grundformen städtischer Sozierung* (Manuscript, 1956), 43ff cited in Habermas, 154.

<sup>6</sup> Habermas, 155.

<sup>7</sup> G. W. F. Hegel, *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, trans. T. M. Knox (Oxford, 1952), sect. 315, pp. 203-204 cited in Habermas, 120.

<sup>8</sup> Habermas, 120.

<sup>9</sup> Gramsci, 32.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 34 original emphasis.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 104-105.



## REFERENCES CITED

- Allier, Joseph. "Sociétés Des Amis Des Arts De Paris, Bordeaux, Lyon etc." *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 38-66.
- Allier, Joseph. "Exposition Des Ouvrages De David." *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 252-264.
- Annuaire de la Société des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatique*. Paris: Commission des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques, 1866-1956.
- Aurenche, Marie-Laure. *Édouard Charton et l'invention du Magasin pittoresque (1833-1870)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1951.
- Bahrtdt, Hans Paul. *Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit als Grundformen städtischer Sozierung*. Manuscript, 1956.
- Bazard, Saint-Amand. "De l'Esprit Critique." *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 110-121.
- Bellanger, Claude, ed. et al. *Histoire Générale de la Presse Française*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969.
- Berthélet, André, ed. et al. *La Grande Encyclopédie Inventaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Lettres et des Arts*. Paris: H. Lamirault et Cie, 1886-1902.
- Blanc, Louis. *Histoire de Dix Ans*. Paris: 1841.
- Bouglé, C., and Elie Halévy, eds. *Doctrine de Saint-Simon: Exposition: Première Année, 1829*. Paris: Librairie des Sciences Politiques et Sociales Marcel Rivière, 1924.
- Brooke, John L. "Reason and Passion in the Public Sphere: Habermas and the Cultural Historians." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29, no. 1 (Summer, 1998): 43-67.
- Buchez, Philippe. "Quelques Réflexions sur la Littérature et les Beaux-Arts." *Le Producteur* 4 (1826): 189-211.
- Byers, Paula K., ed. *Encyclopedia of World Biography*. Gale Research, 1998.
- Carlisle, Robert. *The Proffered Crown: Saint-Simonianism and the Doctrine of Hope*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. "L'Allemagne Pendant la Guerre de Délivrance." *La Revue Indépendante* 6 (1845): 374-405.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. *De l'Esclavage Colonial*. Paris: Bureau de La Revue Indépendante, 1845.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. *Les Radicaux et La Charte*. Paris: Pagnerre, 1847.

- Carnot, Hippolyte. *Le Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Cultes, depuis le 24 Février jusqu'au 5 Juillet 1848*. Paris: Chez Pagnerre, 1848.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. *Mémoires sur Carnot par son Fils*. Paris: Charavay, Mantoux, Martin, 1893.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. "The Life of N.-L.-Sadi Carnot." In *Reflections on the Motive Power of Heat*, edited by R. H. Thurston, 20-36. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1897.
- Carnot, Hippolyte. *Revue Encyclopédique: Avis*. Paris: Imprimerie d'Everat.
- Carnot, Hippolyte, and Hippolyte Auger, eds. "Prospectus." *Le Gymnase* 1 (1828):
- Carnot, Hippolyte, and Saint-Amand Bazard, eds. *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition. 2me Année. – 1829-1830*. Paris : Bureau de L'Organisateur et du Globe, 1830.
- Carnot, Paul. *Hippolyte Carnot et le Ministère de l'Instruction Publique de la IIe République (24 février-5 juillet 1848)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948.
- Cerclet, Antoine. "Considérations Philosophiques sur la Littérature." *Le Producteur* 1 (1825): 49-60.
- Charléty, Sébastien. *Histoire du Saint-Simonisme (1825-1864)*. Paris: Éditions Gonthier, 1931.
- Constant, Benjamin. "L'Industrie et la Morale Considérées dans leur rapport avec la liberté; par Charles Barthélemy Dunoyer, ancien rédacteur du Censeur européen; avec cette épigraphe: Nous ne devenons libres qu'en devenant industriels et moraux." *La Revue Encyclopédique* 29 (Jan.-March, 1826): 416-435
- "Contre La Tendence Industrielle du Siècle." *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 232-241.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime*. Cambridge, Mass.: 1982.
- "Discussions Philosophiques." *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 5-16, 99-108.
- Eley, Geoff. "Nations, Publics and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century." In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 289-339. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992.
- Enfantin, Barthélemy-Prosper. "Le Temps – L'Opinion Publique." *Le Producteur* 3 (1826): 5-15.
- Enfantin, Barthélemy-Prosper. "Réponse au Globe." *Le Producteur* 4 (1826): 499-508.
- "Établissement et Direction des Écoles Primaires Gratuites D'Adultes." *Le Gymnase* 2 (1828): 258-264.
- Garnier, Adolphe. "De L'Art Dramatique." *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 543-552, 588-606.

- Girardin, Émile de. *De la Presse Périodique*. Paris: 1836.
- Goblot, Jean-Jacques. *Le Globe, 1824-1830: Documents pour Servir à l'Histoire de la Presse Littéraire*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993.
- Goblot, Jean-Jacques. *La Jeune France Libérale: Le Globe et son Groupe Littéraire: 1824-1830*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1995.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- Guerard, Albert Leon. *French Prophets of Yesterday: A Study of Religious Thought under the Second Empire*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1913.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.
- Halévy, Léon, ed. "Prospectus." *Le Producteur* 1 (1825): 3-16.
- Halévy, Léon. "Bulletins Littéraires : No. Ier." *Le Producteur* 1 (1825): 125-131.
- Harismendy, Patrick. *Sadi Carnot: L'ingénieur de la République*. Paris: Perrin, 1995.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Oxford: 1952.
- Iggers, Georg, ed. *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition*. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.
- Irvine, William D. *The Boulanger Affair Reconsidered: Royalism, Boulangism, and the Origins of the Radical Right in France*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Kant, Immanuel. "What is Enlightenment?" In *On History*, edited by Lewis White Beck, 3-10. Indianapolis: 1957.
- Lagarde-Fouquet, Annie, and Christian Lagarde. *Édouard Charton (1807-1890) et le Combat Contre l'Ignorance*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2006.
- Larousse, Pierre, ed. *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle: Français, Historique, Géographique, Mythologique, Bibliographique, Littéraire, Artistique, Scientifique, etc. etc.* Paris: Administration du Grand Dictionnaire Universel, 1866-1877.
- "Les Académies." *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 212-225.
- "Les Académies." *Le Gymnase* 4 (1828): 22-32, 116-125.
- Maitron, Jean, and Claude Pannetier, and Michel Cordillot, eds. *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*. Paris: l'Atelier, 1964-1997.
- Manuel, Frank. *The Prophets of Paris*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.
- Melton, James van Horn. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Nettement, Alfred. *La Presse Parisienne*. Paris: 1846.
- Nobécourt, R.-G. *La Vie d'Armand Carrel*. Paris: Librairie Gallimard, 1930.
- Nye, Robert A. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France*. New York: 1993.
- Pécaut, Félix. *Études au Jour le Jour sur l'Education Nationale*. 1879
- Pickering, Mary. *Auguste Comte : An Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- "Postscriptum du Directeur." *Le Gymnase* 4 (1828): 271-272.
- "Préface." *La Revue Encyclopédique* 60 (Oct.-Dec., 1833): i-lxxi.
- Prévost, M., and Roman d'Amat, eds. *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1956.
- Quérard, Joseph-Marie, ed. *La France Littéraire ou Dictionnaire Bibliographique des Savants, Historiens et Gens de Lettres de la France, ainsi que des Littérateurs Étrangers qui ont Écrit en Français, plus Particulièrement Pendant les XVIIIe et XIXe Siècles*. Paris: Didot, 1827-1839.
- Quérard, Joseph-Marie, ed. et al. *La Littérature Française Contemporaine*. Paris : Daguin frères, 1842-1857.
- Reddy, William. "Condottieri of the Pen: Journalists and the Public Sphere in Postrevolutionary France (1815-1850)." *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (Dec., 1994): 1546-1570.
- Reinhard, Marcel. *Le Grand Carnot*. Paris: Hachette, 1950-1952.
- Régnier, Philippe. "Les Saint-Simoniens, le Prêtre et l'Artiste." *Romantisme*, no. 67 (1990-91): 31-45.
- Saint-Simon, Claude-Henri de, and Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin. *Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*. Paris: E. Dentu, 1865-1878.
- Senty, Ambroise. "Théâtre Français – Léonidas, Tragédie en Cinq Actes, par M. Pichat." *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 212-223.
- Senty, Ambroise. "Revue Littéraire." *Le Producteur* 2 (1826): 412-419.
- "Société de la Morale Chrétienne: Séance du 14 Juillet." *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 121-135.

- “Sociétés Philanthropiques,” *Le Gymnase* 1 (1828): 80-91.
- Stendhal, *D'un Nouveau Complot Contre les Industriels*. Paris: Sautelet et Ce, 1825.
- “Théâtres : Un Mot sur la Crise Actuelle du Théâtre.” *Le Gymnase* 3 (1828): 169-184.
- “Un Moraliste au Cours de M. Cousin.” *Le Gymnase* 1 (1828): 258-269.
- Vapereau, Gustave. *Dictionnaire Universel des Littératures*. Paris: Hachette, 1876.
- Viard, Bruno. *Pierre Leroux: Penseur de l'Humanité*. Éditions Sulliver, 2009.
- Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Williams, Gwyn A. “The Concept of ‘Egemonia’ in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes in Interpretation.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 21, no. 4 (Oct.-Dec., 1960): 586-599.